DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 691	SE 009 213

TITLE	Report of a Conference on The College, The Community and Conservation (Washington, D.C., May 22-23, 1967).
INSTITUTION	Conservation Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 67
NOTE	105
AVAILABLE FROM	The Conservation Foundation, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role, *Community Service Programs, Conference Reports, *Conservation Education, *Continuation Education, *Environmental Education
IDENTIFIERS	Higher Education Act, Title I

ABSTRACT

Summaries of papers and discussions at a conference of directors and administrators of college community service and continuing education projects related to conservation and funded under Title I of the 1965 Higher Education Act are presented. The papers summarized consider the following topics: methods of eliciting support of public and private sources of assistance in co-operative community projects, obtaining congressional support, and the critical influences in environmental decisions. General discussions on community responses to Title I, university faculty and administrative attitudes, and curricular materials including audio-visual presentations are also summarized. Appendices provide a bibliography of resource material, a guide to relevant U.S. Government directories and Federal Aid catalogues, brief summaries of some conservation related Title I projects, and a copy of Title I. (AL)

ED 046 691

THE COLLEGE, THE COMMUNITY AND CONSERVATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Conference Report from The Conservation Foundation

SE 009 213

The Conservation Foundation is a non-profit organization without endowment, chartered for the following purposes: To promote knowledge of the earth's resources—its waters, soils, minerals, plant and animal life; to initiate research and education about these resources and their relation to each other; to ascertain the most effective methods of making them available and useful to people; to assess population trends and their effect upon environment; finally, to encourage human conduct to sustain and enrich life on earth.

ED 046 691

Report of a Conference on

THE COLLEGE, THE COMMUNITY AND CONSERVATION

Sponsored by

The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. 20036

To appraise and assist promising new college and university community service and continuing education programs in land-use planning and air, land and water conservation, with special reference to Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965

May 22-23, 1967
Washington, D. C.

Price: $1.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE: With the exception of opening remarks by Russell E. Train, which are reproduced in full, the statements of all speakers and discussion participants have been summarized by The Conservation Foundation for this report. The chronological sequence of the conference has been followed except for the "Summary of General Discussion Periods" (page 53), which is a composite drawn from several portions of the conference.

Page

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS 1

INTRODUCTION 7
Sydney Howe, Senior Associate, The Conservation Foundation, Conference Coordinator

NEEDED: INFORMED FORCES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY 10
Opening Remarks by Russell E. Train, President The Conservation Foundation

PANEL: HOW DECISIONS ARE MADE ABOUT ENVIRONMENTS: THE CRITICAL INFLUENCES 14
Moderated by Thomas W. Richards, Member, Arlington County (Virginia) Board

1. LOCAL GOVERNMENT 14
Norman Beckman, Director, Office of Intergovernmental Relations and Urban Program Coordination, U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development

2. PRIVATE ENTERPRISE 16
John M. King, Director of Design and Environmental Studies, National Association of Home Builders

3. THE EFFECTIVE CITIZEN 19
Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, former board member and National Water Chairman, League of Women Voters of the U.S.

4. DISCUSSION 20

Page

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC VALUES 25
Luncheon Remarks by Jules Pagano, Director of Adult Education Programs, U.S. Office of Education

PANEL: USING AND CULTIVATING THE HELP AT HAND: PUBLIC AGENCY ASSISTANCE 31
Moderated by Frank Gregg, Vice President, The Conservation Foundation

1. FEDERAL AGENCIES 31
William J. Duddleson, Chief, Division of Council Studies (President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty) U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

2. STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES 33
Charles H. W. Foster, President, The Nature Conservancy (former Commissioner of Natural Resources, Commonwealth of Massachusetts)

3. LOCAL GOVERNMENT 34
Ronald M. Dick, Field Service Director, National Association of Counties

PANEL: USING AND CULTIVATING THE HELP AT HAND: NON-GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE 36
Moderated by Frank Gregg and Marvin Zeldin, Director of Information, The Conservation Foundation

1. COMMUNITY LEADERS, PROFESSIONALS AND ORGANIZATIONS 36
Ann Satterthwaite, Associate in Planning, The Conservation Foundation

2. THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY 38
James G. Watt, Staff Associate for Natural Resources, Chamber of Commerce of the USA

3. NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS 40
Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director, The Izaak Walton League of America

4. THE UNIVERSITY ITSELF 43
John W. Fanning, Vice President for Service, University of Georgia

5. DISCUSSION 46

Page

OBTAINING CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT 50
Luncheon Remarks by Robert J. Pitchell, Executive Director, National University Extension Association

SUMMARY OF GENERAL DISCUSSION PERIODS

1. Community Responses to Title I 53
2. University Faculty and Administration Attitudes 56
3. Title I Budgeting and Project Development 57
4. Curriculum Materials 60
5. A Special Audio-visual Approach -- "The Big Squeeze".. 62

CLOSING REMARKS 68
Frank Gregg

APPENDICES

A. Bibliography of Resource Material Distributed or Displayed at the Conference 70
B. "U.S. Government Directories and Federal Aid Catalogs," a guide prepared for the conference by William J. Duddleson 73
C. Brief Summaries of Title I and Related Projects of Interest to the Conference 78
D. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 96

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

John Adams, Title I Prog. Off.
Community Services & Continuing Edu.
U.S. Office of Education
Regional Office Building
7th & D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

George E. Allen
Area Extension Agent
Court House
Cumberland, Maryland 21502

Mrs. Richard W. Bardwell
Capital Community Citizens
208 Lathrop Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53705

Floyd V. Barker, Extension Coor.
Natural Resources, Morrill Hall
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hamsphire 03824

Norman Beckman, Director
Office of Intergovernmental
Relations and Urban Program Coor.
U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Dev.
Washington, D. C. 20410

Chester P. Bednar, Title I Officer
U.S. Office of Education
Dept. of Health, Educ. & Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

W. Frank Blair, Prof. of Zoology
Box 7366 University Station
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

John M. Blake, Assoc. Dir.
Continuing Education Division
Merrill Hall
University of Maine
Orono, Maine 04473

Walter Bogan, Field Coordinator
Scientists' Inst. for Public Infor.
30 East 68th Street
New York, New York 10021

Eurcelle A. Bowler
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Conference Registrar)

Ted Browne
Denver Research Institute
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Louis S. Clapper, Chief
Conservation Education Division
National Wildlife Federation
1412 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

John M. Claunch, Dean
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas 75222

Charles A. Dambach, Director
Natural Resources Institute
Ohio State University
1885 Neill Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Paul Delker, Branch Chief
Community Serv. & Continuing Educ.
U.S. Office of Education
Regional Office Building
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Robert T. Dennis, Asst. Con. Dir.
The Izaak Walton League of America
719 13th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Ronald M. Dick, Field Service Rep.
National Association of Counties
1001 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

Stanley J. Drazek
Chairman, Title I Adv. Council
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20740

William J. Duddleson, Chief
Division of Council Studies
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C. 20240

William H. Eddy, Jr.
The Conservation Foundation
Bolton Road
Harvard, Massachusetts 01451

F. Robert Edman, Director
Consulting Services Corp.
690 North Robert Street
St. Paul, Minn. 55101

Clifford E. Emanuelson, Assoc. Dir.
Pinchot Institute for Conser. Studies
Milford, Pennsylvania 18337

Giordano Enrico, State Coor.
Florida Board of Regents
P. O. Box 1562
Tallahassee, Fla. 32302

Robert L. Ewigleben, Dean
Administrative Affairs
Humboldt State College
Arcata, California 95521

John W. Fanning
Vice President for Services
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

Eugene S. Farley
Wilkes College
Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania 18703

Charles H.W. Foster, Pres.
The Nature Conservancy
1522 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

John C. Frey, Director
Land and Water Resources
108 Research Building #3
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

John W. Gates, Director
Div. of Adult Edu. & Comm. Serv.
The University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming 82070

Warren K. Giese
Dept. Head of Health and P. E.
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Lloyd Graven, Instructor
General Extension Division
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Frank Gregg, Vice President
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

Frank W. Hagan, Coordinator
Title I, Higher Education Act
University of Maine
Orono, Maine 04473

George P. Hanna, Jr., Prof.
Dept. of Civil Engineering
Water Resources Center
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Lynn M.F. Harriss, Exe. Dir.
Amer. Soc. of Landscape Architects
2000 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Mrs. Lester G. Hawkins
Land & Water Use Project
League of Women Voters
1200 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Raymond G. Hay, Associate
Marcou, O'Leary & Assoc.
1735 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Bernard F. Hillenbrand, Exe. Dir.
National Association of Counties
1001 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

Cecil Hoffman, Staff
President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty
Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C. 20240

Sydney Howe, Senior Associate
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Conference Coordinator)

John D. Huss, Asst. Director
Fellowships and Manpower
Office of Intergvt'l. Relations
Dept. of Housing & Urban Develop.
Washington, D. C. 20410

Walter E. Jeske, Head
Educational Relations
Soil Conservation Service
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture
Washington, D. C. 20250

Carl J. Johnson, Exe. Dir.
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin
203 Transportation Building
Washington, D. C. 20006

Miss Anne Kales
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Conference Assistant)

John M. King, Director
Design & Environmental Studies
National Assn. of Home Builders
1625 L Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dana A. Little, Director
Public Affairs Research Center
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine 04011

Huey B. Long, Assoc. Director
Urban Research Center
Florida State University
2323 So. Washington Avenue
Titusville, Florida 32780

Charles B. Lord, Coordinator
Title I, Higher Education Act
Center for Continuing Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

William D. Lutes, Asst. Director
Title I Higher Education
511 Nebraska Hall
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Irene MacManus, Asst. Editor
American Forests
American Forestry Association
919 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Richard V. McCann, Exe. Dir.
Higher Educa. Facilities Comm.
45 Bromfield Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

James Y. McDonald, Title I Coor.
Room 300 S, Admin. Building
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

John McKee, Director
Center for Resources Studies
Bowdoin College
Brunswick, Maine 04011

Hugo V. Mailey, Head
Institute of Regional Affairs
Wilkes College
Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania 18703

J. Paxton Marshall, Asst. Dir.
Cooperative Extension Service
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20740

Robert B. Mitchell, Assoc. Dir.
Kentucky Research Foundation
University of Kentucky
301 Administration Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

William F. Murison, Director
Center for Comm. Development
Humboldt State College
Arcata, California 95521

John A. Naegele, Head
Dept. of Environmental Studies
University of Massachusetts
240 Beaver Street
Waltham, Massachusetts 02154

John H. Noyes
Prof. of Forestry
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

John C. O'Neill, Dir., Title I
116 Administration Building
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, R. I. 02881

Jules Pagano, Director
Adult Education Programs
Regional Office Building
7th & D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Patricia Patterson, Prog. Asst.
Title I, Higher Education Act
U. S. Office of Education
Dept. of Health, Educa. & Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Dir.
The Izaak Walton League of America
719 13th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Andre C. de Porry
Director of General Extension
School of General Studies
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Va. 22203

Samuel Pratt, Dean
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Florham-Madison Campus
285 Madison Avenue
Madison, New Jersey 07940

Thomas W. Richards
3838 North 25th Street
Arlington, Virginia 22207

Reed C. Richardson, Dep. Dir.
Bureau of Econo. & Business Research
P. O. Box 806, Foothill Station
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

James T. Robison
Comm. Service & Continuing Educa.
U.S. Office of Education
Regional Office Building
7th & D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

David A. Rock, Acting Director
Glen Helen Office
Antioch College
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum
Overseas Education Fund
League of Women Voters
1200 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

E. R. Ryden
University of Maryland
College Park, Md. 20740

Charles L. Samuels, Rep.
Title I State Administrator
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W. Va. 26506

Miss Ann Satterthwaite
Senior Associate
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mrs. C. F. S. Sharpe
Prog. Spec., Water Resources
League of Women Voters
1200 17th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Andrew J. W. Scheffey
Associate Professor
Resource Policy
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002

Richard Sheridan, Assoc. Prof.
Dir., Water Resources Project
Dept. of History & Government
Montana State University
Bozeman, Montana 59715

Theodore Sidor
Extension Resources
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Harold Snyder, Chairman
Biology Department
Taylor University
Upland, Indiana 46989

J. Russell Snyder
Director of Graduate Studies
Frostburg State College
Frostburg, Maryland 21533

Wayne Sommer, Head
Conservation Educa. Development
Natural Resources Institute
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20740

Joseph J. Soporowski, Jr.
Assoc. Extension Specialist
College of Agri. & Env. Science
Rutgers - The State University
New Brunswick, N. J. 08903

Drexel Sprecher, Vice President
Leadership Resources, Inc.
1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Henry Strong
Hattie M. Strong Foundation
1625 I Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Richard A. Swavely, Asst. Dir.
Regional Administration
Pennsylvania State University
McKeesport, Pennsylvania 15132

William H. Tishler, Asst. Prof.
Dept. of Landscape Architecture
The University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Russell E. Train, President
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

Paul M. VanWegen, President
Stony Brook Millstone Watershed Assn.
P. O. Box 171
Pennington, New Jersey 08534

Gerald F. Vaughn, Coordinator
Community & Resource Development
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

Thomas R. Waggener
College of Forestry
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

Robert C. Wakefield
Professor of Agro.
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, R. I. 02881

James G. Watt, Staff Assoc.
Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.
1615 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20006

Silas B. Weeks, Ext. Economist
Morrill Hall
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

J. Eugene Welden, Title I Prog. Off.
Community Serv. & Continuing Educa.
U.S. Office of Education
7th and D Streets, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

L. E. Westin
State Title Comm. Serv. Director
Commission for Higher Education
555 Wabasha Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Mrs. Margaret Bush Wilson
Administrator, Title I
Off. of State & Regional Planning
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Lloyd W. Woodruff
Extension Specialist
Public Administration
University of California
Davis, California 95616

Marvin Zeldin
Director of Information
The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

Gordon K. Zimmerman, Exe. Sec.
National Association of Soil and
Water Conservation Districts
1025 Vermont Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Sally A. Zinno, Prog. Assistant
U.S. Office of Education
Division of Adult Education
Dept. of Health, Educa. & Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20201

INTRODUCTION

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 initiated a program of grants to colleges and universities "for the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health and land use." Since 1965 the U. S. Office of Education has provided $10 million annually to meet 75% of the cost of some 1,160 "Title I" projects in community service and continuing education at more than 370 public and private institutions.

In 1966 The Conservation Foundation recognized Title I as a high-leverage opportunity to provide citizens and local officials with knowledge of environmental conditions and conservation action methods. It appeared to us that a program with the potential of reaching every junior college, community college, college and university--and of expanding the community service capacities of extension services--could in time do more to extend community conservation action than any other activity in sight.

With encouragement and cooperation from officials of the U. S. Office of Education, the National University Extension Association, and the Adult Education Association of the U. S. A., the Foundation contacted administrators and directors of approximately 30 Title I projects then known to be concerned with natural resources and environmental conservation. We thus became familiar with the substance of a variety of university-based community projects which look very much like advance elements of a major new conservation force (see Appendix C).

The Foundation's CF Letter for March 31, 1967, was devoted to these projects and their potentials. In response to several expressions of need for communication among those conducting Title I and related extension programs, we determined to hold the national conference reported herein.

Conference invitations went to all directors and administrators of Title I projects in conservation fields, to the office in each state which governs use of Title I funds by institutions of higher education, to the U. S. Office of Education's Title I advisory group, and to a few representatives of public and private conservation agencies. Each invitation asked that its recipient notify us of others who should be invited, and many did so. Some 200 invitations were extended, and 100 persons took part in the conference.

The Foundation offered to meet travel and other conference expenses, on a fifty-dollar-deductible basis, for participants whose institutions could not assist them. Eight persons accepted this aid. The U. S. Office of Education authorized state offices presiding over Title I to use administrative funds for conference expenses.

The letter of invitation stated:

> It is our conviction that there are exciting opportunities for cooperation among leaders in college- and university-sponsored continuing education, professionals in conservation, planning and design, and representatives of public and private organizations concerned with environmental quality. This program will bring together leading authorities and practitioners in continuing education and environmental fields to familiarize each with the competence and resources of all.

The authorities did come. Their desire to know one another and to exchange knowledge and experience gained in pursuing relatively new programs was a built-in "plus" for the conference. We believe that the following report is a faithful representation of their formal sessions together.

Two principal aspects of this two-day gathering are not evident herein: first, the informal but intense personal exchange which filled the unscheduled moments; and second, the literature displays describing many participants' projects in detail, which attracted much browsing and note-taking.

An evaluation of the conference, was prepared by Leadership Resources, Inc., of Washington, D. C., based upon direct observation of the proceedings, upon conversations with participants and our staff and upon questionnaires completed by participants at the close of the conference. A few copies of the evaluation report are available from The Conservation Foundation on a first-come basis.

While none of the speakers and discussants reported herein would consider his treatment definitive, we are encouraged to believe that the participation of each--and the conference itself--will boost the effectiveness of a promising new public program.

The Foundation invites readers of this report to suggest further steps it might take in the same direction. We shall gladly assist those pursuing opportunities discussed in the conference.

Sydney Howe, Senior Associate
The Conservation Foundation
Conference Coordinator

NEEDED: INFORMED FORCES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Opening Remarks by Russell E. Train, President
The Conservation Foundation

It has been my lot to explore conservation education needs with educators on several occasions recently. Much of this exploration has been concerned with formal education.

It is an unfortunate fact that only a few exceptional schools and teachers are really preparing young Americans to appreciate and to influence in an intelligent fashion the physical environments in which they will spend their lives. A mere handful of higher education centers are producing environmental specialists who are prepared to work hand-in-glove with other kinds of specialists and laymen. The physical environments we occupy, and the natural resources upon which life depends, are manageable only as complex, ever-changing, living systems, and only within close limits which men ignore at great peril.

Our Foundation is undertaking several new initiatives which we hope will contribute substantially to environmental education in the area of formal curriculum. (I shall be glad to discuss these with any of you during the coming two days.) These activities are geared to the long haul, in the hope that perhaps two decades hence our people and the professionals who serve them in environmental fields will be better equipped to cope with the physical world they inherit.

But perhaps even more pressing is the kind of education that we have come together to discuss here. It is entirely conceivable that the environmental inheritance of those who live 20 years hence will be quite wretched. Therefore, we must accelerate now the application of now-known and feasible conservation methods to the management of land, water and air. If we do not, the long-haul goals of conservation education may prove truly "academic" in every sense of the word.

One hears much about today's environmental crises--blighted cities, sprawling suburbs, degraded air and water, diminished wilderness and wildlife, and several more--but really, if one examines the recent legislative record in Washington and numerous state capitals one finds a surprising array of new authority, and some funds, for public action directed to these ills. At the same time, there are obvious grounds for fear that new programs for city renewal, open space protection, pollution control and water conservation, among others, will go under-nourished.

And the principal nourishment must come from citizens and community officials who understand environmental problems, who appreciate the conservation tools at hand, and commit themselves to action.

Unless those who would be served by clean water, livable cities, healthful recreation opportunities, and all the rest--unless they (or at least many more among them) become informed, inspired and active in these matters, we shall all receive a very small bang for our government buck; laws will go unenforced, and program goals will be missed. Even the best government cannot effectively renew waterways, enforce pesticide controls or create new uses of land in the absence of informed community support and participation from those affected. Thus, conservation remains a highly political animal.

Furthermore, it is those who know and those who care who must act at all the pressure points of government to buttress and expand good programs and to cut deadwood and duplication from wasteful ones.

And this is where you in university-based continuing education and community service and we in environmental planning and conservation come in.

A relatively small number of Americans constitute the conservation movement today (although it is growing rapidly) and its resources remain miserably inadequate to the environmental challenges we face. Conservation as a cause has often seemed to many reasonable people to represent a narrow, special interest viewpoint associated with emotional outcries against plundering man. Today, we must broaden the conservation base. The environmental problems we face require nothing less than a commitment by our total society. You in our universities and colleges provide the knowledge and the intellectual tools necessary to that commitment.

In fact, I consider you and literally thousands of your associates to be this nation's most promising conservation agents. You represent a fresh spirit of broad community service, and new resources are being put at your disposal. You have a wealth of faculty competence to draw upon, and, as several persons here have demonstrated already, you are rather free to innovate.

I think two additional factors are even more pertinent. First, people are ready for you. The citizens of New York State who a year ago voted four-to-one for a one-billion-dollar pollution control bond issue--the second largest state bond issue of any kind in the nation's history--were not simply conservationists. All kinds of people are worried about the quality of their environments, and their worry commonly exceeds their knowledge of what to do about it. To be sure, you still must "sell" your programs and create situations for learning and action which satisfy your public, but I believe you start with strong motivation in your favor.

And secondly, the newly-concerned people I have been describing will listen to you. The university, as an impartial institution, can and must present the facts of environmental life responsibly. You also can define alternative courses of community action in response to environmental facts, and you can generate the trained leaders who will define and implement action programs.

I have just come from a visit to the University of California at Berkeley where I spoke on the role of foundations and universities in conservation. I stressed the opportunity for both to work together in the community. If Title I projects generate community action on behalf of environmental quality, foundations--particularly local foundations--can help provide the necessary funds.

I also suggested that, if universities are going to deal effectively with a wide range of complex community problems, they are going to have to apply interdisciplinary approaches to their solution. I suspect that many universities are poorly equipped to meet this need.

Lastly, while at Berkeley I had an opportunity to talk with a number of students about some of these matters. Frankly, I think the students may be way ahead of us. They are impatient with the traditional compartments they find in the typical university curriculum. They are anxious for community involvements.

I hope that your discussion here will consider ways and means of using your students in Title I projects. If you miss this opportunity, you will be neglecting what is our single most important resource for the future.

HOW DECISIONS ARE MADE ABOUT ENVIRONMENTS:

THE CRITICAL INFLUENCES

Summary of Panel Statements and Discussion Moderated by Thomas W. Richards, Member, Arlington County (Virginia) Board:

1. Local Government, Norman Beckman, Director, Office of Intergovernmental Relations and Urban Program Coordination, U. S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development

The Department of Housing and Urban Development recognizes two principal problem areas for local governments: the problems of central cities (especially those of low-income families) and problems stemming from rapid urbanization.

Our universities have a long record of assistance on problems of local governments. Examples of this record are the Cooperative Extension Services, Bureaus of Municipal Research and Urban Extension (sponsored in part by the Ford Foundation).

Still on the horizon is the suggestion of our own Undersecretary, Bob Wood, for a series of urban observatories. This would mean establishment of a pattern of consistent research to be done by a number of city universities throughout the country to meet problems that the mayors of these communities find to be most pressing. Research would be conducted in such a way that comparative results and analysis could be made in different situations across the country, but it would be directed to actual problems faced by municipal officials.

Local government is where most of the public funds are collected and where most of them are spent. It is very fragmented, but we are going to have to live with this and with traditional local "sovereignty," because few local officials are willing to abdicate this sovereignty. Yet, there are new developments which will help deal with metropolitan areas in which local governments are not meeting metropolitan needs.

There is, for instance, the rise of the urban county. This unit of government commonly has the necessary space, is large, and has a broad tax base. Urban counties do need more powers and less restrictions in order to do the job. We have also seen an increase in inter-local contracting whereby local governments do things jointly: the councils of governments. These are both examples of improving local government machinery. We are going to have to continue to reduce restrictions which keep local governments from helping themselves.

Local governments will be improved only if the federal and state governments are willing to help them. Among HUD's programs having this objective are the "701" comprehensive metropolitan planning assistance and the two-thirds matching grants to the 50 or 60 councils of elected officials that have sprung up in metropolitan regions of the country. Numerous regional planning requirements accompany these programs--especially in mass transit, water and sewer and open space. We have coming up (funded by House action so far) a grant program to the states to provide technical assistance services to communities of less than 100,000 population.

Despite the many new ideas and programs, we have a long way to go. It will take a lot of political, professional and managerial talent just to make the present system work.

We hope to assist the evolution of regional governmental machinery--most likely along the lines of councils of elected officials--that can supervise and provide political responsibility and backing for metropolitan planning. The professional competence and skills of the planner need the public accountability and leadership that these councils can provide. We also need improved metropolitan information and education services for citizens, greater participation by those who will be affected by government programs, and integrated regional fiscal plans to help meet regional goals.

2. Private Enterprise, John M. King, Director of Design and Environmental Studies, National Association of Home Builders

There are four basic points that I wish to contribute to this discussion of environmental decision-making.

One - A reminder that the magnitude of private and public decisions affecting our environments that must be made in the near future is extraordinary, and that the rate of decision-making is rapidly increasing.

Two - A large proportion of decisions made by the private sector are influenced by public decisions and opinions.

Three - There is cause for optimism, I believe, in seeking greater concurrence of public and private interests, provided that there is extensive understanding of motivations and objectives and a willingness to discuss differences.

Four - Title I community service programs offer a tremendous opportunity for creating better understanding and encouraging discussion between the public and private sectors.

The magnitude of environmental decisions to be made is well-illustrated, although understated, in President Johnson's 1965 Message to Congress on the cities; "Our new city dwellers will need homes and schools and public services. By 1975, we will need over 2 million new homes a year. We will need schools for 10 million additional children, welfare and health facilities for 5 million more people over the age of 60, transportation facilities for the daily movement of 200 million people, and more than 80 million automobiles..."

Historically the decisions that have had the greatest influence in shaping our physical environment have been decisions made at a local level; the decision of a business to locate or expand; the decision of a builder to develop land and build houses; and the decision of a local government to extend sewer, water, and public services.

The question, what motivates and influences the decision makers at a local level is complex and elusive. As a step toward answering the question, I suggest that there are at least three basic concerns that are applicable to the decision makers of the private sector.

First, there is, I believe, a desire for accomplishment in terms of responsibility to the larger community--a moral or societal value that affects decisions to a greater or lesser degree and is related to a hierarchy of individual and group values.

Second, there is the desire and need to satisfy individual and corporate goals through the attainment of profit: profit to perservere and perpetuate; profit to re-invest, progress and grow; and profit to allow individual and family identity, security and stimulation.

Third, there is a myriad of influences that induce or require, restrict or prevent, actions to be taken by decision makers. Relating this to the private builder-developer, a partial listing of inter-related influences might include: alternative locations and costs of land; availability of sewer, water, power, schools, and other public and private facilities and services; annexation policy; assessment practice; taxation; zoning and other land controls; housing and building codes; capital to invest; availability and terms of financing; labor and subcontract skills and costs; products that can be used; and so on and so on.

As a means of furthering their own interests and goals, segments of the private sector have established local organizations, thereby adding to the network of community power structures that influence public opinion and government policy and plans. These organizations include the bankers, lawyers, architects, firemen, apartment managers, labor, builders and, of course, the Chamber of Commerce joining together various business interests.

Now, it isn't likely that we could change the basic motivations of the individual businessman--or for that matter, the public official--even if we wanted to. And, it isn't likely that we could eradicate individual and corporate profit goals, if we wanted to. It is likely that we can, and highly desirable that we should, attempt to bring together all local decision makers for the purpose of molding mutually constructive influences that will be directed toward solving environmental problems.

The process of bargaining, if it is to achieve meaningful results, requires mutual understanding of intents, goals, and positions. This is where the emphasis must be placed--the gaining of understanding at all levels of decision making, and involving all individuals and groups concerned with and involved in shaping our environment.

We are continually finding that local community organizations and informal citizens' protest movements exert considerable influence over public plans and policies in the area of environmental planning and design. Public bodies and officials are often unprepared to cope rationally with the uninformed and emotional demands of these groups.

If Title I funds are used to achieve better understanding and foster the mutual goals of public and private interests, they will make a real and lasting contribution.

I hope that many Title I community service programs will be directed toward bringing together all local interests concerned with community development and growth, away from the battlefields of protest meetings, budget reviews, and zoning hearings. Then, the bargaining across the table will produce joint decisions that will begin to fulfill our aspirations for a better environment.

To stimulate the development of these programs, the National Association of Home Builders, as one part of the private sector, will encourage the local cooperation of its membership throughout the country.

3. The Effective Citizen, Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, Former Board Member and National Water Chairman, League of Women Voters of the U. S. A.

I'm not nearly as optimistic as the previous two panelists. Most people are apathetic about most issues and they are particularly indifferent to conservation. I do not anticipate that this situation will ever be radically changed. But this doesn't mean that we cannot accomplish some goals.

Private citizens can be, and often are, aroused when one particular thing catches their interest, and on this they will get together and do a splendid job. But once that particular response has taken place, most of them lose interest and the force that took action is dissipated until some other crisis arises.

One reason for this lack of sustained interest is that Americans seem to spread themselves thinly and belong to many groups at the same time. They seem to pay the most attention to the groups which share their own points of view. If a differing viewpoint is represented they lose interest. This is an area of tremendous challenge to you educators. University people are particularly qualified to bring people of varying points of view together in some kind of consensus-making situation.

The environmental decisions that must be made should be made by citizens who will end up paying for them. Growing numbers of citizens are insisting upon hearing all the alternatives. There are many citizen organizations which would be able to contribute to responsible decision-making if they could only get the facts. Here again resource people, educators and university people can meet this need by supplying facts.

A citizens' committee having a mutual concern or interest can do a very important job of informing the electorate by gathering, organizing and disseminating information, by getting on the telephone when time is a factor, or even simply by persuading fellow citizens to turn out for a "yes" vote on the ballot. But above all, do not expect instant success from such groups and do not expect perfection. They need and welcome any guidance they can get.

4. Discussion

Richards: How can we elicit the sustained interest of community groups and citizens in environmental quality problems? When such interest is evident it seems always to be a response to some crisis situation.

Rosenblum: There are groups, such as the League of Women Voters, which do have a sustained interest in these questions, but some of them often seem to have a fairly narrow viewpoint.

King: The groups that do have a sustained interest are what I like to call the like-minded groups. More important in environmental quality questions is the interest of the non-like-minded groups, the ones with diverse opinions, feelings and attitudes.

Beckman: As far as the government is concerned, the real problem at the national level has been to get something on the books and funded. Once this step has been made and a program has begun I think you will get sustained interest...at least at the national level. I can cite air pollution and water pollution as examples of what I'm trying to say.

Scheffey: I'd like to hear a little more about the urban observatories idea that Mr. Beckman mentioned. Might this be an answer to the whole problem of sustained interest?

Beckman: The idea behind the urban observatories is to bring the great resources of our universities, many of which are located in the hearts of cities, to bear on the real problems of their own cities. It's really just establishment of meaningful town-gown relationships. What is unique about the idea is the possibility of common problems being identified by a number of cities and universities and being studied at the same time. This would build a basis for comparative analyses and findings that could become generally applicable. It would mean much more than simply discovering how to solve a particular problem in a particular city situation.

Farley: The best place to find out more about the urban observatory idea is from Mayor Maier of Milwaukee. I believe that he was its originator. Another aspect of the observatory idea is the probability that the university will end up as the only neutral party in its city. Today, a university often thinks its job is done when it has brought a variety of groups together to talk about a problem. The observatory idea would prolong university involvement and provide the neutral ground and sustained interest that is lacking.

Weeks: We've heard quite a bit about the problems of urban centers. I think some of these problems are due to the fact that rural America is deteriorating, and to the extent that it deteriorates it passes its problems on to the cities. HUD for example requires a "regional" approach to problem solving, and this looks fine on paper. But in examining rural areas I find that this is a major deterrent to improving our environment. This is true for three reasons: first, in rural areas there is seldom a political structure for the kind of area, i.e., regional, coordination which is called for in federal programs; second, there are no technical personnel who can understand and deal with agency bureaucratic counterparts in terms of jargon and procedures; and third, rural communities are used to dealing with federal programs, essentially those of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, that have local county offices. HUD is administered by regional offices. These are rarely able to communicate both with people in rural areas and thus are unrealistic administrative units if HUD desires its programs to be understood and used in rural areas.

Beckman: I think what you have said leads to a larger question: do we have a national policy on population, on migration, on regional development? We do, to an extent, for we are putting a disproportionate amount of our resources into depressed areas. My own agency actually gives funds more liberally to the smaller communities--those under 50,000. Of course, a great many congressmen represent such districts. Also, part of HUD's and the administration's new legislation before congress this year is funding for non-metropolitan multi-county development districts. There is an increasing recognition of the need to assist not only growing metropolitan areas but also the more rural areas that are experiencing population decline.

Blair: Getting back to the question of sustaining interest, I think one reason we have been unsuccessful is because most of our college graduates are absolutely ignorant of anything pertinent to environment. There is a very good historical reason for this, particularly in the field of biology. In the last twenty years we've had enormously exciting break-throughs in the so-called field of molecular biology. Forward-looking school boards, textbooks and students would not be in the mainstream if they failed to concentrate on molecules--up to cells and no further. This means that our students come through standard courses in biology knowing nothing about environment. I think this is a very serious problem that we as educators must solve--getting environmental biology into the curriculum, from grammar school through university-level courses.

__Soporowski__: I agree. At Rutgers we think there is a basic need for comprehensive training and understanding at the undergraduate level at least! Students must learn about land, air, water, waste disposal and the other intricacies of the environment before they go on to specialize at the graduate level.

__Bardwell__: I agree with the statement that most people, laymen and professionals alike, need to know more about environment. It seems to me that the most important question to be answered is how large the good community should be. I would like to know what HUD is doing and what the various universities with their test communities, their urban observatories and other programs are doing towards defining the ideal size for a specific community. I don't think that we can solve the other environmental problems until this question is answered.

__Beckman__: In order to answer that question I'd say we needed about five or six times as much money as we now have for research. We have had a break-through in appropriations, and I think we're in for the beginnings of an institute on urban development. The closest we've come to defining the size of a community is some indication that a minimum size for achieving any kind of professionalism and economy of scale would revolve around the 50,000 population level. This of course varies with the kind of service and the local situation, but anything less than that raises problems of inter-jurisdictional competition for scarce skills and causes a generally higher per capita cost.

The urban observatory idea about which we've been talking poses a unique opportunity for tackling questions such as this. We visualize a national network of observatories which would have six distinctive features; they would:

1. serve as collection points for basic information on urban development,
2. conduct policy-oriented research on selected major issues of concern to mayors and other elected officials,

3. make studies available to local officials facing policy decisions on such environmental matters as transportation, open space, sewage and so on,
4. be staffed by professionals,
5. be guided in categories of data collection by the immediate and long-range policy concerns of municipal officials whose cities they are studying,
6. operate as a network, linked by common agreement on the type of information to be collected, with communication channels to assure exchange of information of mutual concern and interest.

But before we get such a network we'll need tremendous additional funding and a greater willingness within university staffs to muddy their hands in the hard world of city politics.

CONTINUING EDUCATION AND PUBLIC VALUES

Luncheon Remarks by Jules Pagano, Director of Adult Education Programs, U. S. Office of Education

Today I propose to take a look at the whole area of university resources and the question of creating the kinds of environment that we feel are maximum potential builders for human life.

In the last week I have clipped two interesting newspaper articles. One is about a protest group which moved in on Mayor Lindsay and demanded that he appoint a conservation director. What had moved them to ask for a conservation director at a very high level--at least at the level of the Department of Sanitation--was that Pelham Bay Park was about to become a dump. And the first duty given to the conservation director was not one in education or development but one of identifying and saving irreplaceable natural areas.

The second article I clipped carried a quote by the present governor of California, who said, "A tree? -- Who needs one? If you've seen one you've seen 'em all." Well, in a literal sense he's absolutely right. But the important point is that here we have in the city of New York a positive political action and in California a representative of the people taking a position that ignores the impact of human development pressures on trees. We're certainly at a stage in this country that calls for compromise, for learning to live with each other, and for learning to look at resources and problems in new ways.

Perhaps we're all somewhat like the Boy Scouts who were on a trip, and one said to the other, "Speaking for myself, I know I'm trustworthy, and I know I'm loyal and I know I'm helpful, and I know I'm courteous, and I'm kind and obedient, I'm cheerful and I'm thrifty, I'm brave and I'm clean, but you know what, I'm lost!"

I think all of us could identify very strongly with that scout and recognize that we are truly lost in this whole area of trying to find ways to effectively relate the development of responsive environments to human growth and human development as we understand it, with all the pluralities and all the diversities in our society. This is a very crucial time, because our society's values--as listed by the boy scout--are being torn apart and re-defined and changed. We speak of this in terms of ecological gap, of cultural gap, and we make up other "gaps."

We don't have the process that effectively allows us to build the kind of society that not only accepts change but relates change to human values as we all know them. We're all caught in the development of value systems as they come.

The Supreme Court has probably had the greatest effect upon our value systems in recent years with its decision calling for "one-man-one-vote." This is a whole new look at the role of the individual. A new kind of power is being given to the individual and the role he can play. The privacy question seems a very crucial one, and more decisions are going to be made concerning it. These changes will affect education in and for our cities and our towns and our homes and especially our family life in communities.

These are not matters of gerrymandering structure, but matters of how we all inter-relate--how we can cultivate processes which allow inter-action, how we can use the resources that we have. I think you represent a very significant movement, a new cooperation to use university resources and federal matching funds in new ways. The federal funds are allowing communities and institutions of higher learning to start meaningful dialogues to produce problem-solving action.

Problem solving is the new phrase for what used to be whatever you did in your home town, or anywhere, when you had a get-together in search of a consensus or solution. But now, solutions will no longer be simple and they will not be permanent. They will always be in process, and we must have some sort of permanent process: a process by which community leadership for a given activity can continuously articulate again the problems it is facing; a process by which a university, whether through a department of community development, a department of conservation, an extension arm or a continuing education arm, can really belong in a community and really have something to offer; a process by which a university can learn as an institution as well as render service. These are the kind of on-going processes that we are trying to establish.

This means new peers in the community. It means that university representatives--faculty and staff--are equal peers with students and the clientele of towns and cities. For both sides this is a new kind of relationship. This is not simple. It is not authoritarian. These are the highest expectations we have in education, of quality education, of equals gathered together for common solutions and understanding, knowledge and training.

Not long ago, Norbert Wiener, while talking about the role of us in education, and especially continuing education, said: "We can no longer afford technological break-throughs that do not consider the cost imposed on the human system in which they operate. We need people with the courage and the perspective to repair the damages of the past, look ahead before the crises occur and seek creativity in a society that measures up to the new and great expectations."

Our society has very high expectations. Witness the many articulate protests which occur every day and which concern a very wide variety of subjects. We really expect our society to function as it was supposed to, according to what we were told the promise of America would be. Each of us has made his contribution and does not understand why others cannot. We have a hard time seeing that there are flaws and misunderstandings and that there have been failures on the part of the society to really serve all of society.

We have successfully served 70% of our people. We've made the greatest break-throughs in technology in all of mankind's history.

There are great expectations in this period, and we who are assembled here are involved in trying to fulfill some of them, through the process of education in human problems and community problems. We bring a perspective that has not been common in our society before. And you are on the spot because in the competition for federal resources, you simply do not have the most effective spokesmen. Defense, children's needs, health...all the great needs of human life have such spokesmen. But the greater aspects of making that human life meaningful somehow rest at the bottom of this nation's priority lists. Therefore, you need to articulate even better than anyone else the role you play and the crucial factors that concern you. I suggest this as a broad challenge for you.

I think the whole question of education is more crucial than ever before. The federal government will be looking at this as a process that ought to be effective in a way that no other process can. Here, we do not need research; that's not the problem it is in technology or management. We have all the means at our disposal to do our job on both the private side and the public side, so that the real problem comes in allowing people to understand alternatives, to have insights into the effects of technology and into what is happening to the city and to the land.

Much responsibility is placed upon the role of the university in extension work, in community education and in community development, whatever the nomenclature. The fact that you're out there and involved is the most important. A process that leads to responsibility being taken by everybody concerned--including the university, the private groups, the associations and individuals--is what we're all after.

I don't know what the direction will be in federal funding. We could always talk about what would happen if Vietnam should stop. Certainly Title I is viewed and talked about as one of the new ways in which matchmaking federal resources can help to establish a great process in every community and every university. In our planning we have considered what ought to be the major emphasis, and we see that there should be some such program in every U. S. community. We have enough institutions and enough human resources to do this. The problem will be one of developing the managers who relate resources to needs and of developing the clientele. There is no question that there is going to be a forward thrust. The period we're in right now will be the crucial period of proving that it can be done--that we have the know-how.

Furthermore, we must be willing to experiment and to look more at effectiveness than at efficiency. I say effectiveness because all of this could be done very efficiently without involving either the universities or the private side. It could very well be done efficiently by operating as the military does. Military-type control over the northeast could meet the question of air pollution, for example. But we do not do this because we understand too well that it is not effective in the long run. The solutions for our times will come when we find ways of allowing our public institutions--the great institutions that are the backbone of this country in terms of building human dignity, building human values and human beings, and that are above concern over technology and material values--to become involved.

A very good example of the nation's failure to see the proper role of responsible and effective public institutions is what we did with TV. We are now talking about a public TV because we did not understand 15 or 20 years ago that there is a real role for public TV. There is nothing anti-capitalistic about public responsibility in those areas which are crucial to all the people.

The real values in our society are really public. The churches are all public--they have no profit motive. The institutions of higher education, the museums and the foundations are all public. There's nothing irresponsible about their actions, and there's nothing anti-capitalist about them. So I suggest that in this area of developing the environments that we think we ought to have, that people participate in decisions, pay for them and understand the risks they are taking.

There will be waste. It will take time. But, it will be effective and it will last. There will be lessons to build upon and great knowledge and great expertise will be developed at the level where they are needed. And I suggest that you are involved in establishing a new concept of "waste." There is good kind of waste, one that allows people to experiment, to handle problems and learn what they are doing and be willing to say that they've made a goof and will try again. The greatest lessons we learn in life are learned through failures.

We do not expect every project to be a success. We really feel that every project is a success even if you're not doing anything exciting or new. We expect most projects to contain some failures in terms of end results or in terms of immediate results. But we do look for success in the process that you are developing, in the involvement of humans and of institutions. I have a strong feeling that the major lessons and insights will come from projects which seem at first to be failures. Faced with the challenge of a failure, you really take a look at who you are and where you're going.

In the final analysis the federal government is a new kind of partner in all this business. You'll find us primarily listening to you. All we're doing is starting the process in motion, and the feedback will be coming from you--the foundations, the counties and cities and from the institutions involved--to give us the insights we need to further our role. We will make mistakes, as everyone else will, but I do think there is a real commitment on the part of the Office of Education, HEW, and the present leadership in Secretary Gardner and Commissioner Howe to analyze mistakes so that we may learn to be successful.

USING AND CULTIVATING THE HELP AT HAND:

PUBLIC AGENCY ASSISTANCE

Summary of Panel Statements and Discussion Moderated by Frank Gregg, Vice President, The Conservation Foundation:

1. **Federal Agencies**, William J. Duddleson, Chief, Division of Council Studies (President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty), U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

The "Directory of Directories and Catalogue of Catalogues of the Federal Government"* lists several very basic documents which are important to anyone interested in Federal assistance programs. Of these, perhaps the best and most comprehensive is the Office of Economic Opportunity catalogue. In addition, many federal agencies provide information clearing-house services which periodically report developments in a specific field across the country. For example, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's national quarterly "Outdoor Recreation Action" describes a great many activities at all levels of both the private and public sectors. You are all eligible to receive this publication free.

We are all faced with the problem of sorting out a proliferation of material, programs and activities. Your congressmen and senators and their staffs can often be helpful in this respect. In the conservation field one of the best sources of information on what's happening on the Hill is the "Conservation Report" published weekly by the National Wildlife Federation. This is also available to you free of charge.

---

* Mr. Duddleson's euphemism for the listing of Federal directories and catalogues which he prepared for the conference. See Appendix B.

Turning to some of the programs themselves, perhaps you all know that the President's budget for FY 1967-68 includes $17 billion for grant programs to state and local governments--a very sizeable chunk of the domestic budget. Some of the newest and most interesting of these programs are as follows:

1. The Model Cities program - authorized last year for administration by HUD.

2. Urban Waterfront Restoration programs - authorized two years ago and also administered by HUD.

3. 701 Planning Grants - administered by HUD for metropolitan region-wide planning.

4. "New Town" Grants - another HUD program providing federal assistance to developers of entire new communities.

5. Land and Water Conservation Fund program - Department of the Interior, making 50% grants for acquisition and development of land for outdoor recreation purposes.

6. Open Space Land Grants - administered by HUD to assist communities in acquiring and developing land for open-space uses and in carrying out urban beautification programs.

This is certainly not a complete list, but it illustrates the scope of programs directly affecting land use. Better federal programs, better coordination, more imaginative packaging and adequate financing for programs such as these are dependent upon felt needs--needs expressed by local people and felt by federal administrators and members of Congress. It might be exceedingly useful if some of the lessons you are learning through Title I projects were transmitted directly to members of Congress who can do most about improving the federal programs.

2. State and Regional Agencies, Charles H. W. Foster, President, The Nature Conservancy (former Commissioner of Natural Resources, Commonwealth of Massachusetts)

Many different state and regional agencies can be helpful to you in community service and continuing education projects concerned with conservation. In addition to the obvious resource agencies--forestry, parks and recreation, water, wildlife and fisheries--there are health and welfare departments, public works departments and, of course, planning departments.

The services commonly offered by these agencies are of four kinds: first, technical services, ranging from fundamental policy decisions to technical field services; second, people-oriented action services--providing help in solving human environmental problems; third, financial assistance, for these agencies are the local administrators of many different kinds of grants-in-aid; and the fourth kind of service is one of public relations for community conservation programs, because most professional resource people have a wide exposure to people--wide both geographically and within fields of specialty and interest, and through these contacts they can often do a better job of public relations than you can yourself.

There are a few basic guidelines to follow when dealing with these public agency people. First of all, in each state or region there is usually one key man who is most knowledgeable about everything that is going on in the resource field. If he can be identified quickly, wild goose-chases will be avoided when exploring avenues of assistance. Secondly, some kind of regular liaison should be set up in order to speed up the process of working with an agency or agencies. Be selective both among the agencies themselves and among the people within them. Lastly, be specific about what kind of assistance you need and try to be helpful in return.

There is still quite a lot in the area of agency relationships and channels for information and assistance that needs refining. The governmental machinery itself should be streamlined--and from the bottom up. We need more effective linkage between governmental agencies and citizens who are beneficiaries of their programs. We need more initiatives at state and regional levels. We need centers for services and materials in order to sort out the various conservation opportunities at hand and keep all kinds of interested persons up to date in a growing number of fields. We need more civilian involvement in environmental decision-making. We need less red tape in setting up regional or interstate bodies. And lastly, we need to counteract the growing trend towards isolation of universities from actions being taken by resource agencies.

Some of these needs will begin to be filled if you at the university level take the initiative to expand involvement of your own personnel, either through extension services or direct individual participation, in agency activities and decision-making.

3. Local Government, Ronald Dick, Field Service Director, National Association of Counties*

The National Association of Counties has published several action guides concerned with local environmental problems, including water pollution and air pollution (Community Action Programs for Water Pollution Control, Community Action Programs for Air Pollution Control). These are nominally addressed to county officials but are certainly of value for anyone concerned with citizen education and community development.

---

* Mr. Dick substituted at the Conference, on a few moments notice, for Bernard F. Hillenbrand, Executive Director of NACO. As Mr. Dick explained to the Conference, Mr. Hillenbrand was called to an unexpected meeting with the Secretary of the Interior regarding an environmental problem which has long disturbed him--the erection of high voltage transmission lines on the Antietam Battlefield and across the Potomac River nearby.

These guides suggest answers to such fundamental needs of program planning securing enabling legislation, planning for projects, organizing within existing departments, finding financial and technical assistance, financing at the local level, gaining and maintaining public support, staffing and, of course, bringing all these things together in a coordinated and effective program.

USING AND CULTIVATING THE HELP AT HAND:

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ASSISTANCE

Summary of Panel Statements and Discussion Moderated by Frank Gregg, and Marvin Zeldin, Director of Information, The Conservation Foundation:

1. Community Leaders, Professionals and Organizations, Ann Satterthwaite, Associate in Planning, The Conservation Foundation

Community leaders, professionals and organizations are some of the most critical elements in any local, regional, state or federal action program. The leaders know how to move, the professionals have the technical skills and the organizations have a large labor supply.

Although these groups can provide a tremendous resource for action, it must not be forgotten that they represent single-function agencies, each interested in self preservation and an improved image. The professionals are haunted by professional jealousy, the leaders by self-seeking, and the organizations are trying to keep their own houses in peace.

It may be of value to suggest a few possible ways of reaching these groups and individuals through Title I programs and of making them interested, involved and effective in environmental problems.

First and foremost, conservation must be understood and taught as a political process. The dynamics of this process must be appreciated if action in environmental fields is to be effective, and the case method of study is particularly well suited to such political process analyses. Secondly, strategy orientation is needed to counter the rather flatfooted and often martyred conservation activists. Recognize the self interests of these groups and try in some way to capitalize upon them.

In addition to providing training in political processes, Title I can give instruction in scientific processes--ecological relationships, effects of draining methods, changing water courses, impacts of insecticides, the functions of estuaries, etc. These are all things that community leaders, professionals and organized groups, to say nothing of the average citizen, often fail to appreciate but which they must take into consideration if they are to make intelligent environmental decisions.

As you know, Title I projects are not limited to class instruction. Service centers, seminars, clinics, conferences, films and cooperative programs are all being experimented with. Here especially, the give-and-take process between community leaders, professionals and organizations and Title I projects is advantageous. These persons can learn a great deal while they are serving as instructors or leaders in local education programs.

Flexibility in the organization of a project, as well as selectivity in leadership, are also important factors. A basic problem in conservation and environmental action is to change attitudes and behavior, and this is often dependent less upon the facts themselves than upon how they are presented and who presents them.

To sum up, in the process of preparing a community for effective environmental action the leaders, professionals and organizations can provide, respectively, political muscle, technical skills and a supply of willing labor--all critical elements in any action program. These groups may need instruction and guidance in certain environmental matters, but they can also make important contributions to the preparation and execution of Title I projects.

2. The Business Community, James G. Watt, Staff Associate for Natural Resources, Chamber of Commerce of the USA

How do you persuade the business community to join a program which would provide for managing the environment--air pollution, water pollution and land pollution control? Quite frankly, we like to claim that we are good citizens, and we have a tremendous record to point to. But the big motivation is Uncle Sam, who is beginning to make demands, and we are responding because it's in our own interest to be involved when controls are established.

These environmental programs require a joint effort of the business community, the people, governments at all levels, and educational institutions. The colleges and universities play several roles; they inform, they educate, and they conduct research. I urge you not to exclude the business community from your Title I projects for, if action is their objective, the business community must be involved. Its members are the doers and they are the polluters. I assure you that they will want to participate.

It is not enough just to say that a project will have representation from the business community. I think the right people in this case would be not the top management but the middle management--the plant manager, the union leader, employee representatives, etc. If you have a good local Chamber of Commerce, use it. I'm embarrassed to admit that not all local chambers are good, but it's a starting point. Involve your local chambers, your state chambers, trade associations and individual business groups.

There are a few rather basic rules of thumb to follow when approaching these people. First of all, you must be careful to present yourselves accurately. I am speaking now in terms of definitions of the word conservation. Conservation has evolved through three phases:

1 - We originally had the preservationists who wanted to preserve everything at any cost--and of course the businessman cannot participate in that type of movement.

2 - Then we had the regulation period when everything was to be regulated--and a businessman needs his freedom.

3 - And now we are evolving into an informed and disciplined phase of management--we propose to manage our resources and our environment. If we can manage these resources, then we will have conservation--we will preserve, we will utilize and we will develop. With this definition the business community can and will participate.

My second bit of advice is pure common sense. When creating your advisory groups, don't overload them with "bird watchers." Try to have real balance.

Thirdly, avoid sensationalism to attract attention. Use your facts and figures correctly and accurately. For, if you distort them for effect, you will lose the support of the business community.

Title I has a tremendously important role to play--informing, educating, and perhaps being the community catalyst which brings separate groups into effective action programs. The business community is anxious to participate, in order to obtain your assistance and to lend its assistance to you.

3. National Organizations, Joseph W. Penfold, Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America

Most international, national, regional, and state conservation and conservation-interested organizations are listed in the Conservation Directory which is issued annually by the National Wildlife Federation. It may be obtained by sending $1.00 to National Wildlife Federation, 1412 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

How do you contact these organizations? Most of you probably know of those which have local units or affiliates, and through them or other sources you can run down the state leadership. Make your contact by telephone, because citizens groups' offices are notoriously bad correspondents. For any major project, I'd suggest that you also consult the organization's national office, which may know of similar activity in other areas and may be able to enlist assistance for you.

In dealing with citizen organizations, recognize from the start that you will be competing for the volunteer members' free time. Recognize also that such organizations have their own reasons for being, their own projects, and the distinct human trait of being jealous of their own identity. Take the time to get your own activity identified with the interest and concern of the particular organization. Urge that the organization retain its own identity as a sponsor or cooperator in your project. If, in helping with your program its members can know that they are promoting their own purposes and objectives, the extent and quality of their participation will be greater.

Since I'm basically uncertain as to what Title I means, I can tell you what I hope it means. I hope it means better interaction between the academic community, which has the expertise, and the uninformed layman who is devoted to environmental quality and is willing therefore to work to improve it.

Frankly, I and my colleagues in the natural resources field have dealt with too many university people who are so involved in "pure science" or so incarcerated in the ivory tower that they do not care to delve into the frustrating and sometimes dirty mess of public affairs. Your facts, professional advice, and organizational ability are invaluable to the dedicated volunteer.

There is no question that the layman conservationist needs your help. Conversely, you will find that he has much to contribute in the way of time, energy, and practical understanding of social processes.

You may be interested in a couple of citizen education projects in which the Izaak Walton League has been involved. They might have been Title I projects. They indicate that citizen groups are constantly involved in, will contribute to, and will support the kinds of activities discussed during this conference.

Last year, thirteen national organizations cooperated with the League in sponsoring seven Citizen Workshops on Clean Waters for America. There were one national and six regional conferences of up to two and a half days duration to help citizen leaders across the nation understand and help implement the 1965 Water Quality Act. These resulted in interstate, state, and intrastate efforts which can be characterized only as "adult education" projects--plus a "Citizen Guide to Action for Clean Water," some 160,000 copies of which were exhausted in three or four months.

A few details ought to be stressed. The sponsoring organizations were diverse--The Izaak Walton League, The Conservation Foundation, American Fisheries Society, Garden Club of America, General Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters Education Fund, National Association of Counties, National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, National Audubon Society, National Council of State

Garden Clubs, National Wildlife Federation, Sport Fishing Institute, The Wildlife Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

Run through the list and you find two types of organization. First, there are the laymen's groups --in this case, grown from different roots and proving that varied interests will work together toward common goals. Second, there are the professional societies--the organizations of scientists and resource administrators which constitute a working bridge between the people and the public agencies. As in other fields, laymen and professional conservationists must work side by side or neither will prosper.

Perhaps we should have arranged Title I local follow-up to our regional program. But the major point I wish to make is that these state and local groups did excellent jobs wholly on their own initiative because of deep concern about a problem. Think what they might have accomplished with formal and organized support.

Let's turn now to the nearby Potomac, which is theoretically to become a model of river basin planning for the nation. Two years ago, concerned that the citizen wasn't being well enough informed as to what the planners had in mind for his valley, a number of organizations conceived the Citizens' Workshops on Potomac Basin Planning. Again, the sponsors were a number of diverse groups which might not ultimately agree on policy but showed a thirst for substantive information.

Financing and staffing for the initial effort came from the sponsoring organizations. But the follow-up, again--and there has been excellent follow-up in many Potomac communities--has been a seat-of-the-pants affair. Follow-up financing has been largely by small local donations or on a pay-if-you-come basis.

But we already have a Title I resource education project in the Potomac Basin--Frostburg State College's

George's Creek program--and for all I know it has its roots in the basinwide workshop program. At least, the concept is similar.

What points am I trying to make?

- -- Citizens are interested in conservation education for adults. And they are organized.
- -- So are natural resources professionals.
- -- They will work, together, with or without Title I.
- -- They need your help, and you need theirs.
- -- Title I can provide the mechanism to improve greatly the kinds of efforts I've described, to bring them to the local level, and to initiate conservation education projects I haven't even thought of.

I am sure that all of us in national organizations want to help in these important and exciting new opportunities. Try us and find out for sure.

4. The University Itself, John W. Fanning, Vice President for Services, University of Georgia

There are several ways to view the resources of a university as these may relate to any community problem, including that of environmental planning and conservation.

One point of view relates university resources to instruction of undergraduate and graduate students. All universities possess this responsibility and have resources with which to discharge it.

Another point of view has to do with research on community problems including that of environmental planning and conservation. Most universities possess this responsibility and have the resources with which to discharge it.

The third point of view is that of public service. This is a responsibility of all land grant universities, and many other universities accept it but not all. I have reference here to the involvement of the university with its resources in aiding communities in the solution of their problems--whatever they may be, and certainly one of these is environmental planning and conservation.

The university which I represent has deeply committed its resources to a program embracing the functions of instruction, research and service. Its basic administrative organization recognizes its responsibilities in each of these three fields and has a vice president for instruction, a vice president for research and a vice president for services.

This university as is true of all land grant universities and many others, therefore, has a deep commitment to service programs.

Perhaps our first question is "What are the resources of the university which should be used and cultivated?" And the answer is "the faculty." Generally speaking, the scope of concern of university faculties is as broad as the scope of concern of their communities.

This faculty resource must be made available to help with the solution of real problems, through a strong university commitment to public service. And the university must organize itself for the purpose.

At the University of Georgia we view staff participation in public service programs dealing with community and other problems in three major ways, namely: instruction, consultation, and studies and research.

Instruction includes formal classes, both credit and non-credit, off campus and on. It includes participation in conferences, seminars, workshops and other instruction of organized groups.

Our Continuing Education Center has the major responsibility in this area, but the Cooperative Extension Service, the Institute of Community and Area Development, the Institute of Continuing Legal Education and the Institute of Government also have responsibilities.

Faculty participation in consultation generally stems from a need for specialized knowledge on a problem which a group or community faces and is usually short-term in nature. We have some full-time specialists to provide this consultation. Other specialists are made from the instruction and research staff.

The Institute of Community and Area Development of the University of Georgia has served as a point of focus on the concern of the University on community and area problems. Its personnel are joint-staffed with their departments of specialization. Its office represents the University's total resources.

The University is called upon to conduct studies and to provide factual information on many community problems. Faculty members participate by serving as project leaders and organizing and conducting the fact finding. They make arrangements for and supervise graduate student participation. They prepare all recommendations.

There are several ways of making faculty available for community service:

-- Full-time responsibility for service, on a 12-months basis.

-- "Banking time," which gives credit for the time a faculty member spends in a service program. The hours involved go into a "bank" of time credited to the individual faculty member, to be paid for at a specified time in some agreed upon manner.

-- "Release time," which means that a portion of the instructional or research obligation of the person is "purchased" or contracted for service contributions.

-- "Joint-staffing," which sets aside a certain portion of the time of a faculty member on a regular basis for public service involvement.

-- "Extra compensation," in which the faculty is compensated at an agreed upon rate.

The office of the Vice President for Services represents our University in all matters relating to service to communities, areas and groups, and it seeks aggressively to involve university resources on problems affecting the people of Georgia.

5. Discussion

Gregg: Have any of you tried to develop cooperative projects in which you've brought in local professional people, not on the faculty of the university but from the community, to participate?

Naegele: We've been quite successful in doing this in Massachusetts. We appointed an advisory council made up of people such as the chancellor of the University of Massachusetts, the conservation editor of the Boston Globe, State Senator Ames, a representative of the Massachusetts Audubon Society and several others. Then we got these fellows together and said, "This is our program. What do you think of it?" And they gave us thoughtful suggestions and advice. This is a continuing advisory council, and as our program develops I'm sure we will call upon these people again and again--either as a group or individually as things develop in their particular areas.

Wilson: We are thinking of setting up something similar to this for our Title I work in Missouri. I was wondering how you went about getting their reactions. Did you have a program set up to begin with?

Sidor: On the matter of developing cooperation with different groups and organizations, in Oregon we've found that it is better to develop cooperation from individuals by identifying them as individuals rather than as representatives of organizations.

Weeks: We've had the same experience in New Hampshire. We've found that if you use citizen groups as sponsors or advisors, and their members come in as organization representatives, they have to defend their organization's viewpoints. But if you free them from this obligation, saying, "We need your personal help," the problem dissolves.

Penfold: This is an interesting situation. Being an organization man perhaps I'm biased. I look at it this way, and I can use the Izaak Walton League as an example. We have in the Washington area perhaps a dozen chapters with a total membership of something like 6,000 people. Now, I'm sure that in setting up a meeting, workshop or conference, picking individuals who could contribute with the least amount of friction would make for a nice friendly affair. But, we are not trying to get at these half dozen or so people that we have invited to contribute directly. We are trying to get at all 6,000 of those people. An individual at a meeting, even though his ideas may be good ones, will have little influence if he does not represent a significant segment of the populace.

Warren: I'd like to address a question to Mr. Fanning about problems within the university itself. Do problems develop between academically-oriented portions of the university and the Title I extension work because the latter is not specifically academically oriented?

Fanning: I think this is likely to happen in all universities, but it will usually be among individuals rather than large groups. Some people feel that the university should not move into public service. They think the university's job is educating young people

Naegele: Yes, we had some ideas, and their reactions and responses led to some modifications and eventually to our present program. You have to start with something. If you set in a room surrounded by a glorified vacuum, nothing happens.

Allen: We've had a very interesting experience with professionals in our George's Creek, Maryland, project which is just getting started. In our inventory of the area we included personnel resources and discovered a great many professional people whom we are now utilizing in a technical advisory capacity. We are now planning a two-day course in the comprehensive approach to problem solving, in cooperation with these people.

Naegele: There seemed to be an assumption on the part of a number of the speakers both today and yesterday that Title I is for action. I myself feel a certain requirement to be something other than action-oriented. Is Title I an action program or is it an educational program? For example, we have felt that we could not become involved in the support of a particular piece of legislation. We felt we could educate people in terms of the pros and cons of a bill and that we could lead people to joining an action agency or group of their choice. But our becoming directly involved in supporting a given bill would produce a precarious situation.

Watt: What I was thinking of in terms of an action program was that the programs which you pull together, acting as the magnet pulling together different segments of the community, will result in some kind of action.

Adams: I'm from the Title I national office. We think of Title I as not a pure research program, not a fact-gathering program, but a community-informing program. Whether this results in some kind of action depends upon the community.

and doing research. Many individuals in many institutions believe this, but the barrier is gradually being broken down--and mostly by Title I because of increased pressure from local government to have service from the university.

Waggener: We've developed at the University of Washington, at least internally, a strong commitment to move in this area, but we've run into a bit of a problem. The state legislature really calls the shots. The university asked for fairly modest sums for such things before Title I existed. We would have been far ahead on our program if we'd had an extension arm to begin with. I wonder where a university can turn in a situation such as this, when it lacks the support of the legislature.

Fanning: The University of Georgia was very lucky in this respect because we had a grant from the Kellog Foundation to start our program of extension work. The universities that were fortunate enough to get foundation or other outside support have found that the programs have become so popular that it is less difficult to get the once hard-to-find state support. At the same time, we are finding that more local governments appreciate the advantages of extension services, particularly for training local officials. Our own state governing board, a Board of Regents, never allocated any money to us for extension or public services until this year, when we got a modest sum. But we consider this a tremendous breakthrough.

OBTAINING CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

Luncheon Remarks by Robert J. Pitchell, Executive Director, National University Extension Association*

A word or two about NUEA. It was formed in 1915 and now consists of 128 U.S. and foreign institutions of higher education, of which a majority have on-going programs in extension.

We are especially interested in the work of The Conservation Foundation in this conference because one of the most dynamic divisions in our association is the Community Development Division. This group is extremely interested in the Title I program and community development in general, and it can be counted on for a great deal of support.

Probably the most important aspect of the Title I program is the federal funds it has made available, and it is really up to you to see to it that the Congress continues to appropriate these funds. How do you get Congressional support?

From my experience in politics both as student and practitioner on the Hill, I believe that there is no effective substitute for a strong program. A good image and a strong program will get support.

---

* Title I appropriations happened to come up for congressional action during the first day of the conference. Dr. Pitchell's remarks were given on short notice, in response to Mr. Howe's request that he explain the legislation's status at that point (not reported here) and discuss the politics of supporting Title I.

We've found that both the congressman and their staffs know very little about Title I programs. We have not compiled the supporting data adequately yet. We need to do much more in this field. It's one of the hardest programs to develop good solid, perceptive, convincing statistics on because it is an incremental program. The effectiveness is going to be in small increments, with no dramatic results overnight. That's the way the educational process works, and this is one of the fundamental education programs. We have to live with this and learn how to translate it into language, ideas and images that the congressmen and their staffs can appreciate.

As important as having a strong Title I program is the development and expression of strong grass roots support for it. Congress will not listen as closely to the words of a Washington representative of an association as it will to people who feel strongly enough about something to take the time and the effort to communicate with their congressman.

The higher the rank of the person communicating with a congressman, the better. When a university president takes the time to come to Washington to talk with his senator or congressman, he is clearly registering a strong feeling because he doesn't do it very often. Relying on a dean or assistant dean isn't nearly so effective, as it becomes obvious that the importance to the university is reduced.

Geographically distributed support is also important--both within a state and nationwide. We must get all our friends and allies throughout the country involved in this.

Everyone becomes important, either personally or to the extent that he has access to someone of influence. Our most serious weakness so far is that we have failed almost completely to bring municipal and county government representatives into active support of Title I.

Without timing and coordination, much effort can be wasted and many potential impacts lost. You must find out when your congressman or senator will be making decisions about education bills and get your information to him beforehand. It is obviously useless and a waste of his time and yours to approach him at a time when he is considering something entirely unrelated to education like defense expenditures or foreign aid. National organizations such as NUEA can be helpful to you in this important area of timing and coordination.

SUMMARY OF GENERAL DISCUSSION PERIODS

1. Community Responses to Title I

Howe: A Title I project at the University of New Hampshire is seeking to inform members of official town conservation commissions concerning environmental quality issues and methods of tackling them. Would Mr. Barker, who directs the project, tell us what kind of reception your activities have had?

Barker: We think they've been effective. Of course, we've only been in operation since February, but we have made contact with all 66 of New Hampshire's municipal conservation commissions and they have shown an interest. They have asked us to organize meetings, regular meetings, as soon as possible, in most cases inviting local planning boards and other groups to sit in. The commissions want somebody to point out just what they can do, how to get started, how to take an inventory of a community's natural resources, types of maps to use, and other things along these lines.

Howe: In a session sponsored by the Humboldt State College Title I project two months ago in California, I was interested to find county officials discussing the expected impact of a proposed national redwood park. They expressed a wish that some respected neutral force had been present three years ago to air planning alternatives affecting economic stability, social welfare and land use. The issue was too hot for any local group to handle. I'd like Bill Murison to tell us a little more about this project if he would.

Murison: The park issue was really tearing the community apart, so much so that the interest in all other issues suffered. There was no concern for local recreational facilities, for a better development of the local resource base, or for the rather crucial problem of unemployment. And these problems were obvious.

With Title I there came an opportunity to see what could be done. It took about three months of just pedaling up and down an area about the size of Indiana, in which we are the only educational institution, telling people who we were and what we were and what we hoped to do. A great deal of suspicion was encountered, primarily because people wondered how much this was going to cost them. When they were told it would cost nothing they wondered what was in it for them. And when we told them that there would be substantial benefits in terms of technical help, planning, and so forth, for the betterment of whatever it was they were interested in, they began to listen.

We are now operating both as an information service--by conferences, seminars, symposia and so forth--and more particularly and more effectively through actual involvement with agencies, by sitting round the table with the Mayor and Council, by getting involved in the Chamber of Commerce, by actually talking to agencies such as the Forest Service that are concerned with our problems at other levels.

McDonald: Dr. Murison, have you had any contact with or cooperation from the Agricultural Extension people in the agency of state government that is responsible for community development, economic development and related functions?

Murison: No. This is a problem. There is a California Extension office in the area which has been primarily interested in dealing with the problems of farmers and ranchers. Otherwise, it has not been too concerned with the larger problems of the community. But California Extension as a whole has recognized this problem, this regional void if you will, and has offered to assist our program with its Title I money. You must remember that we are very isolated. We're 400 miles north of San Francisco, and we do suffer from cultural, physical and informational isolation. If you're looking for suggestions as to how the conservation people can render service in such an area, I would suggest that the Title I programs give all the federal agencies a way of getting their feet wet. If we're going to have a regional pattern under Title I, with an office in San Francisco for example, I think that regional information and referral services would be useful. We need answers to such questions as, "How does the Model Cities legislation effect us?" and "How does the Land and Water Conservation Fund help us?"

Woodruff: Our experiences with Title I at the Davis campus of the University of California have been a little different from Dr. Murison's. Our Title I grant was given for a project which we labeled "the State Development Plan." This was done before the November 1966 election. The Office of Planning was to give us the State Development Plan, and then we would use our Title I money to get citizens involved in discussion of the issues in the Plan.

As we began to prepare for the program the elections took place, and we experienced a change-over in the state. The director of the Office of Planning resigned, and the State Development Plan never came out. So we had to shift gears and do something else.

The open space issue is one of the major issues in California today. But we had to get down on our hands and knees and plead with the new administration before being allowed to see their confidential reports on metropolitan open space planning. We have since condensed these reports into a citizens' guide which is available from me or from the Western Center for Community Education, which is part of the statewide office.

Edman: We have an interesting development in Minnesota. We have recently initiated a unique Metropolitan Coordinating Council which has very strong powers. It reviews every federal grant project in metropolitan areas and every state grant, including open-space. It reviews and has veto power over the development plans of every development district and over municipal zoning that affects more than one unit of government. It is a strong new concept.

But with something this strong we need to do a job of communication. We have recommended to the commission that Title I projects through the next five or ten years be as far as possible related to this job. I think we are beginning to work very well with a blending of the advisory committees of universities and the professionally-oriented metropolitan council which I have described.

2. University Faculty and Administration Attitudes

Murison: One of our real problems at Humboldt has been that of getting somebody to do this Title I community service work, because this is non-professional, non-accredited, and kind of menial work. It is neither one thing nor another; you're not community and you're not academic. You're somewhere in the never never land between the two. It's not research and it's not tenured. This is a lesser problem now than it was in the very beginning.

The community has never looked upon the college as being capable of rendering such services, and we're finding it very challenging. I don't think things will ever be the same again in that area. Even the president of the college recognizes this as a legitimate area of activity. Somehow an aura of respectability has finally come upon us.

Waggener: We have had a similar problem at the University of Washington. How do you establish continuing education activities as legitimate functions within the college? How do you get faculty participation when it isn't recognized as an academic undertaking?

Murison: I think the faculty participation will come about gradually. We've had much more success recently. For instance, we had a lake up north which was being threatened by a development company, and I was able to get five faculty members to go on an all-day field trip to the lake with the Board of Supervisors, a public health man and local sports people to look the situation over. The knowledge of the faculty members--a political scientist, a game management man, a fisheries man, an oceanographer, and an economist--added greatly to the discussion. The whole day cost me $12.42 for lunches. This is the kind of cooperation we are beginning to get.

Farley: At Wilkes College we found it was first a question of getting the administration involved. If they were supporting the project they would set up the structure for faculty participation. If the administration is involved, it becomes simply a question of releasing the people who want to do community service work through the structure which has been set up.

Howe: We have a few deans here who are obviously involved and committed in this field. Perhaps they can shed some light on the problem of mobilizing university resources for Title I projects.

Pratt: I think the situation in each college or university is so specific that it is difficult to give any general advice. In one college a dean may not want the burden of having to hire more faculty because community service consumes half the time of his staff. In another, the dean may consider this the way to give his younger men some involvement in life, some action-oriented exposure, so he recruits supplementary personnel.

One thing we must overcome is the familiar attitude of the faculty member who asks, "What are the things that pay off in my profession?" At this point Title I work is not listed in faculty manuals for tenure, for promotion or for the other things that faculty members rightfully seek. We are going to have to re-define the goals of the university and its faculty so that community service activity is no longer given lower status than teaching or research.

3. Title I Budgeting and Project Development

Mailey: Money for research is not permitted under Title I unless the research is a preliminary to the community action program. But, I have heard that you can use certain Department of Defense funds as the college's matching 25%. I understand that one institution is doing this. I wonder if this is entirely cricket?

Delker: If they are doing it, they will be in trouble with the auditors. The legislation says specifically non-federal funds.

Howe: On this question of research, I've been curious about a project being run by an economist named Wallace at Berkeley, California. It involves land-use surveys, analyses of the way changes in land use might affect land and tax values in the county north of San Francisco Bay. This would seem to be research, but apparently knowledgeable citizens are taking part in evaluation of data and are expected to apply what they learn to improvement of county land and taxation policies.

Woodruff: I'm not connected with this project, but I did talk to the auditor of the coordinating council about Wallace's project. Apparently, the project proposal had to be rewritten. I think the rationale behind the original proposal was that this wasn't really basic research, but rather the collection of data that already existed and that the integration of this data was oriented toward an action program. We've mentioned difficulties in getting faculty involvement in these projects, and I think that restriction of research activities contributes to the difficulty.

Long: We have an unusual situation at Florida State that some of you might be encouraged to try to duplicate. We have a Ford Foundation grant which allows us to do our research, and then we use our Title I funds for our action projects.

Waggener: Along these same lines I'd like an answer to the problem of how to budget for projects which are obviously going to last for more than one year, when Title I funds are coming in annual increments? I'm sure, for instance, that Dr. Murison considers his program a continuing one.

Murison: If we get the funds, it will continue! It would be disastrous if we were suddenly cut off and this is one of our main concerns. How do we insure that we continue to function? We are thinking of asking that the Board of Trustees of the State College of California make our activity a legitimate part of the college program in the area. We are already using students quite effectively in our work, and there doesn't seem to be any reason why they shouldn't get credit as well as experience from the operation. I also think we might try to follow the line that Mr. Long suggested, of trying to get foundation support.

Scheffey: Dr. Murison, you mentioned that you are using students in your work at Humboldt. I'd like to hear more about that, and I wonder if any other projects are doing likewise.

Murison: We are writing recreational plans for cities and towns in the area; we're trying to push the idea of fish protein concentrate plants, and we're doing a variety of other things--some of them resource-oriented, some people-oriented. I'm finding students of tremendous help to me in these matters. In the work-study programs we are using a great many students. We can buy an awful lot of talent for just a few dollars this way.

Mailey: We've been using students at Wilkes College also. They are mostly undergraduate students, political science majors. They have to be closely supervised, but they do commendable work. Getting funds for this is no problem, and as a matter of fact it is a good way of seeing what they actually learn in the classroom.

Long: At Florida State we've been using graduate students in various positions. They really seem to enjoy the work and find that it is valuable field experience.

4. Curriculum Materials

Howe: Do any of you have comments to make concerning the quality and supply of published materials and other aids for continuing education concerning land-use planning and environmental conservation?

Dambach: We are very concerned about materials at Ohio State. There is such a flood of material that it appears overwhelming. We are interested in finding out whether or not it is really having an impact. We have initiated a study of conservation materials to find out where they come from, how much is being produced, to whom it is distributed, what happens to it, and if the right things do not happen, why? Essentially what we've found is that there is an awful lot of junk. There are some very good materials, but over-all it is far from reaching its mark. There is an enormous waste.

For example, much of the material prepared for schools is prepared without any consultation with an editor, is written by a professional for professionals, and winds up being distributed to teachers who are supposed to teach fifth-graders. The immediate purpose of our study is to determine whether or not it would be wise to call a conference to consider how the agencies and others preparing materials could do a more effective job. We would include in such a conference the educators who are on the receiving end of this avalanche of material.

Long: One of the objectives of our program at Florida State is to serve as a conduit between the university and the community. I think it would help us if one of the many conservation organizations could serve as a conduit between us and the other organizations. In other words, if we had a clearing house for conservation materials, speakers lists, films and the like, we would each avoid going through much unfamiliar material, often without success, in search of a particular item.

Pratt: At Fairleigh Dickinson, we avoided this problem somewhat by creating our own program material. We started by calling a conference of nationally-recognized authorities in our problem area, air and water pollution. Using a combination of Ampex and General Electric video equipment, we filmed 40 hours of this conference on video-tape. Then we had an expert on air and an expert on water condense this into one hour of air pollution tape and one hour of water pollution tape.

In presenting a community program, we make arrangements with a local sponsor, be it the League of Women Voters, a garden club, or the local air pollution officer. The local sponsor will gather the audience and form a panel of local persons concerned with the problem. At the appointed time they all view our tape with us.

The video-tape is a very versatile piece of equipment. We can quickly select from the one-hour tape those segments which are most pertinent to a particular community. Or, we can run it straight through, or run it for five minutes and then stop for discussion or comments from the panel. We have two monitors, and we've tried many different arrangements, such as having the audience looking straight ahead, or breaking them into small groups with one group viewing the monitor in one direction and another group in another, with sub-discussion leaders.

Howe: About how much does this operation cost?

Pratt: We own the equipment and transport it by station wagon. Depending on how far we go it runs about $100 - $150 per individual program. The investment for the equipment is roughly $5,000, none of which came from our Title I funds.

We have also used other less expensive methods of creating our materials. For one project a sociologist and a motion film professor used Super-8 film with a sound strip to make a 38-minute movie of a single welfare family. This film has had a very great impact and will probably be reproduced in additional copies and utilized by the state for training Welfare Board workers.

In another project we have used hallway automatic slide techniques which we have found effective in setting an audience up mentally before they enter the room where a program will take place.

5. A Special Audio-Visual Approach -- "The Big Squeeze"

(On the evening of May 22, William Eddy, Jr., of The Conservation Foundation presented and discussed an experimental slide-tape program which he has produced for the purpose of stimulating civic discussion of community conservation problems.)

Eddy: There are an infinite number of ways of reaching people about environmental concepts. A variety of ways not only in the medium of presentation--be it a pamphlet, public service radio commercial, film-strip or magazine advertisement--but also a variety of ways in terms of the method of approach.

As far as the method of approach is concerned, The Conservation Foundation has been experimenting with a very special kind of audio-visual technique to meet very specific needs. In 1965, we went to work in Massachusetts to compose a program that would arouse concern for what was happening to the urban and suburban environment of Boston. What we wanted was a tool that could be put in the hands of local groups--garden clubs, Leagues of Women Voters, Kiwanis, etc., and especially the community conservation commissions.

We wanted a short program that would not dominate an entire evening but could serve as a springboard for discussion. This program would present general issues in a way that would lead residents of a given community to discuss specific occurences of the same issues as blights on their own surroundings.

We considered 16mm color movies, but found that they are unnecessarily expensive and become outdated very quickly. There is no flexibility after a film has been completed. Changing a sound track or film is very expensive, and environmental films become dated quickly--within six months or a year. We also considered film strips, but we didn't like the visual effect produced when the projector knob is turned, the picture slides down, and the next one takes its place. Often the commentary on a film strip appears as lettering across the base of the picture or on a completely separate frame which is hard to read. It is a very static medium for school work, and young people don't seem to respond to it at all.

So we settled for slides, but slides used in a rather unusual way. Instead of putting a slide on a screen, then letting the screen go dark momentarily before the next one comes on, we decided to experiment a bit with dissolving or fading one slide into another without interruption. Not only was this easier on the eyes, but it ultimately led to a more flexible medium, as I'll describe in a minute.

Our next task was to put a record and sound track on ¼" tape, with the tape also carrying inaudible impulses which would trigger the projector to change. It sounds complicated. The equipment that we have is not yet satisfactory. We are trying to develop a single unit containing a built-in synchronizer and a tape cartridge.

The materials cost for producing a 10- to 12-minute program of 35mm slides and tape is about $35 or $40. The program offers a great deal of flexibility. If a slide becomes outdated, it's no trouble at all to go out and take another to replace it.

Our program, "The Big Squeeze," involves showing you 95 slides in 11 minutes. That sounds unpleasant. Hopefully, it is not. There are places in which the screen goes dark--there's no picture at all. This is intentional. People are not used to looking at a dark screen while hearing a narration continue. We did this to see if attention would be focused more sharply on what is being said, without the distraction of a picture visible at the same moment.

We designed this program for showing in Massachusetts. Often we find that by the time a meeting is over the group has forgotten about our program, but is really involved in its own community problems. Some have become angry about the program, but have subsequently joined in discussing its subject matter, later forgetting about the program completely.

(SHOWING OF "THE BIG SQUEEZE")

(Unidentified): This sets conservation back about 50 years. I've been listening to this kind of stuff for 40 years and I don't think it's any good. The scare tactics that I sense in this presentation will not convince people that conservation is desirable.

(Unidentified): I would say just the reverse. This is very effective. I've seen this happen with college students. There are aesthetic qualities in your production, and many college students are impressed with such a technique. The message, as you pointed out, isn't really everything. The technique and the mood and everything else, I think, are very effective. So, I would disagree 100%.

(Unidentified): I can go to 1,000 places and see quite the opposite of this. In other words, I think you have picked the undesirable features of the environment for your message, and these do not truly represent the environment you're talking about.

Eddy: Supposing we had sat down for 11 minutes and looked at a series of pictures that represent the beautiful parts of America, along with a sound track of America the Beautiful. Where would we be then?

(Unidentified): It would be much more effective.

(Unidentified): It's very difficult to analyze any particular program or communications device without knowing the audience viewing it. Most people that I deal with would not be moved by this at all, because there's an underlying assumption that quiet nature, relatively undeveloped country, etc., have positive value. Most of the youngsters I deal with have not experienced this. They don't have a drive to experience it. But that doesn't mean that they cannot be responsive to a conservation message, if it's put forward in terms of their values and their experience.

Eddy: Is there an argument that, if they have not experienced quiet undeveloped nature, that therefore they should not be exposed to it?

(Unidentified): In that case you wouldn't use this. You would turn to America the Beautiful. You'd try to create the value first and then come along with this and say that the value we have just shown you is about to disappear.

(Unidentified): By way of a positive suggestion: instead of loading the narration with "use the land, use the land," instill a positive value like "use the land wisely." This might make it more acceptable.

(Unidentified): I agree--I think the show emphasizes the negative and neglects the positive.

Eddy: OK. But should that be the function of this program? In designing something to produce reaction in an audience or any group of people assembling for a meeting, do you get more mileage from presenting a controversy such as this or from America the Beautiful?

Rock: I think you need the impact that this gives. You can't get it by emphasizing the good or the beautiful. That has to be the other part of the program. But you've got to have the contrast. Without the contrast you don't have a presentation.

Eddy: Good point. We designed this thing for meetings in Massachusetts. We find that by the time a meeting is over people have forgotten about the program but are really involved in their own community problems. Some get angry about the program, some say it isn't that bad, while others say no it's much worse. But the point is that an involvement usually evolves which stems from the program but people forget about the program completely.

(Unidentified): In December 1965, the Virginia Outdoor Recreation Department showed a film prepared by Colonial Williamsburg called "A Time to Begin" to the Governor's Conference on Natural Beauty. It was very effective and there was great demand for it throughout Virginia. At the time I was staff associate to the Maryland Scenic Beauty Commission, and we arranged to show it at the Maryland conference, too. Response again was very good. Everyone was thrilled; they were ready to act and they did. The difference between the two is that "A Time to Begin" had more balance, more of the positive to show the wonderful things we want to keep. I think if your showing had 20 or 30 percent more of the positive, then the balance would be good.

Eddy: Yes, fine, but that film was 30 minutes long. There has been a greater demand for this program in Massachusetts than we could possibly meet. This indicates to me that there just isn't enough material available in this line. Ours is not necessarily a good or successful program, but it's one of the only ones available. There is lots of room for more experimentation in the audio-visual approach. There is a need for an audio-visual technique which is geared toward conservation and which, like this program, is very inexpensive to produce.

Howe: I'd like to know if Mr. Soporowsky thinks there is something special in this technique. My guess would be that he was bothered by the success of the mood created by this program. Perhaps his worry is that a good technique has been used to present what he believes is the wrong subject matter.

(Unidentified) Well, the slide technique is effective. That is true. What I object to is the program's emotional kind of appeal.

Eddy: I don't feel that this medium should be used for just one kind of approach. I agree that there is a need for ecological approaches to these problems also, but I have here the program which I find draws the people into the shop to begin with. Once they are in, then there's time for the more sound, factual approach.

(Unidentified): Let's get back to the technique. As I understand it, this is a one-man show. You did the pictures, soundtrack, everything. If so, what is the availability of it?

Eddy: We are developing a single unit machine which will have a dissolving slide projector and cartridge tape, all-in-one.

(Unidentified): Has anyone made available any series of stock programs for use with this technique?

Eddy: The Massachusetts Audubon Society is now considering this. The Society may put together packages containing slides and a ¼" tape soundtrack and make these available to anyone wanting to use them.

CLOSING REMARKS

Frank Gregg, Vice President
The Conservation Foundation

I'd like to say on behalf of the Foundation that we appreciate the confidence that you have shown in us by coming here. I know it must have been puzzling to some of you to ponder our motives and our objectivity and our capacity to be useful to you. We thank you for your confidence, and we hope we have merited it.

We have undertaken this conference because of our own intense concern about the environment. It is our conviction that an environment of dignity for the future can be articulated and can be fashioned only by the people themselves.

We sense that you may hold a key, over the course of years, to developing the capacity of the people of the United States to participate responsibly in fashioning the environment they want for themselves.

We appreciate the comments that you are making on this conference and we will consider them carefully. We appreciate the enthusiasm which you have shown for some of the presentations made by our speakers and the vigor of your discussions with each other. If you've made any suggestions as to what we might do to help you do what needs to be done we appreciate those. And we'll do whatever we appropriately can within the limitations of our budget, our competence (which is not unlimited) and your confidence.

It seems to us that among the most important elements of human freedom is the opportunity to choose an environment that will help each individual achieve his highest aspirations. Our objective and yours is not an environment designed by all-knowing professionals and fastened on the public by authoritarian government or by a tasteless mass. What we're after is diversity, innovation, change and choice--in where and how to live and work and play--with clean air, clean water, space and decent housing as a floor that should be available to every citizen. It is the highest calling of conservation to preserve environmental options and environmental freedoms for the future.

We've enjoyed this very much. We look forward to working with you in the months and years ahead for a humane and healthy environment for our people. Thank you very much for coming.

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LITERATURE DISTRIBUTED OR DISPLAYED AT THE CONFERENCE ON "THE COLLEGE, THE COMMUNITY AND CONSERVATION" WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 22-23, 1967

&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&&

(See also separate bibliography of "U.S. GOVERNMENT DIRECTORIES AND FEDERAL AID CATALOGS" prepared by panelist William J. Duddleson for Conference distribution.)

ABC's OF COMMUNITY PLANNING. 1962. Community Planning Division, Sears, Roebuck and Co., Chicago, Illinois 60607. 25¢ (single copy free).

ACTION EDUCATION. Title I Higher Education Act, Florida. Florida Board of Regents Office for Continuing Education, Tallahassee, Fla.

ACTION FOR CLEAN WATER. The Izaak Walton League of America, 1326 Waukegan Road, Glenview, Illinois 60025.

AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL. An address by Russell E. Train, September 6, 1965. The Conservation Foundation, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

BEAUTY FOR AMERICA. Proceedings of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, May 24-25, 1965. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. $2.75

CITIZEN ACTION FOR CLEAN WATER. Report on 1965 Bond Issue Campaign in New York State. Citizens Committee for Clean Water, Room 710, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

A CITIZEN'S POTOMAC PLANNING GUIDE. The Conservation Foundation, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. 20036.

CLEAN AIR FOR YOUR COMMUNITY. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. 25¢

COMMUNITY ACTION FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AND CONSERVATION. 1965. Bureau of Communications, National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10022. $1.00

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL. National Association of Counties/Research Foundation, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. 20036.

CONSERVATION DIRECTORY. 1967. The National Wildlife Federation, 1412 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. $1.00

COUNTY ACTION FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION. 1964. National Association of Counties, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. 20036. Single copy 25¢, 10 or more 15¢ each.

A CRITICAL INDEX OF FILMS AND FILMSTRIPS IN CONSERVATION. 1967. The Conservation Foundation. Order from: O'Hare Books, 10 Bartley Road, Flanders, N. J. 07836. $1.00

FOCUS ON CLEAN WATER. March 1966. Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. 15¢

HOW THE AMERICAN RIVER WAS "SAVED." Sunset Magazine October 1964. Distributed by County of Sacramento, California.

KNOW YOUR RIVER BASIN. 1958. Publication 256. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. 25¢

LAND AND WATER FOR TOMORROW. Training Community Leaders: A Handbook. The League of Women Voters Education Fund, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036. Limited quantity at no cost.

MORE ATTRACTIVE COMMUNITIES FOR CALIFORNIA. 1960. California Roadside Council, Inc., 2636 Ocean Avenue, San Francisco, Cal. $1.00

OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR AMERICA. Report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. January 1962. Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. $2.00

RESOURCES. Publication No. 24, January 1967. Resources for the Future, Inc., 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

SIGNS OUT OF CONTROL. California Roadside Council, 2636 Ocean Avenue, San Francisco, California. 75¢

THIS LAND OF OURS. Community and Conservation Projects for Citizens. Alice Harvey Hubbard. MacMillan 1960.

TIPS ON REACHING THE PUBLIC. 1962. Publication No. 277. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1200 17th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036. 25¢

THE UNITED STATES JAYCEE GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS MANUAL. The United States Jaycees, Box 7, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74102. $1.00

VITAL ISSUES: Conservation Commissions at the Local Level. Center for Information on America, Washington, Connecticut. 1 - 9 copies 35¢ each.

Prepared by The Conservation Foundation, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. 20036. May 18, 1967

APPENDIX B

U.S. GOVERNMENT DIRECTORIES AND FEDERAL AID CATALOGS

(Prepared for the Conference by William J. Duddleson)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

This list describes some Federal Government directories, and some general and specialized catalogs of Federal aid programs. Unless indicated otherwise, they are for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

U.S. GOVERNMENT DIRECTORIES

United States Government Organization Manual. The official handbook of the Federal Government. Includes brief descriptions of Federal agencies, their functions and organization--including names of principal officials and addresses of regional offices. Published annually by the General Services Administration. The 1966-67 edition contains 811 pages and costs $2. (The 1967-68 edition, which will be current as of June 1, 1967, is scheduled for publication July 15, 1967; it will contain about 824 pages and also will cost $2.)

Congressional Directory. The official directory of the Federal Government for use by the Congress. In addition to information about the Congress, it lists the names of principal officials of Federal agencies, including in many cases the names of agency regional directors. Published annually under direction of Joint Committee on Printing. Closing date for 1967 edition (90th Congress, 1st Session) was February 28, 1967. 1,069 pages. $3.50 regular edition; $5 thumb-index edition.

Federal Aid Catalogs (General)*

Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement. Describes some 260 programs of financial and technical assistance to individuals, as well as state and local governments. Explains purpose and eligibility requirements, tells where to apply, and lists available publications. Current as of December 1965. 414 pages. Free. Information Center, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20506. (A revised and updated edition, current as of May 1967, is scheduled to be published by July 1967. Compiled by OEO in cooperation with agencies which operate the 459 programs listed. About 700 pages. Free.)

Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments. This reports programs of assistance to public agencies--in more detail than the OEO catalog. Prepared by Library of Congress for Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. The original catalog, published in 1964, has been updated by 1965 and 1966 supplements. The 1966 supplement, current as of January 1966, includes a cumulative index covering all three volumes. The three volumes contain a total of 476 pages and all three are sold by the Government Printing Office for $1.20. (A completely revised one-volume edition, current as of January 1967, is scheduled for publication before the end of 1967. Inquiries about availability of the 1967 edition may be addressed to Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations (Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Chairman), U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. 20510.)

Handbook of Federal Aids to Communities. Emphasizes programs and information sources that can help community and regional economic development. Published by Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce, in cooperation with other agencies. The 1966 edition includes programs authorized by Congress through 1965. 120 pages. 60 cents. For sale by Department of Commerce field offices as well as the Government Printing Office.

---

*In post-Conference correspondence, New Hampshire Extension Economist Silas B. Weeks urges an addition here: Federal-State Programs for Developing Human and Community Resources, Federal Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Order from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. $1.50.

Federal Programs for Individual and Community Advancement (Agriculture Handbook No. 312). Emphasizes assistance available to rural areas and small towns. 1966. 53 pages. Free. Office of Information, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 20250.

Federal Aids to Local Governments Service. This subscription service is published in loose-leaf format and sold by the year. It describes and lists regional contacts of more than 100 Federal programs designed to help local governments solve physical and social problems of urban areas. New programs and changes in existing programs are reported to subscribers on new pages for insertion in loose-leaf binder. Service began in 1966. Currently about 200 pages. $20 a year to members of National League of Cities; $40 to non-members. For sale by the National League of Cities Information Service, 1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

National Association of Counties Federal Aid Service. County governments which subscribe to this service receive regular mailings describing Federal aid programs. In addition, they are eligible for an inquiry answering service which identifies programs available to the county and other counties already using the programs. Information is available from National Association of Counties, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C. 20036.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Federal Aid Catalogs (Specialized)

In addition to the general catalogs such as those listed above, the Federal Government and others publish catalogs listing (1) Federal aid programs in a limited field but administered by a number of agencies, and (2) all Federal aid programs administered by a single department or agency. A few examples of both kinds are listed below.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Outdoor Recreation Program Catalogs

Federal Assistance in Outdoor Recreation. Briefly describes more than 60 agencies' financial and technical aids to state and local governments, private organizations and individuals. Many of the programs are directly related to natural beauty. Regional office contacts are listed. Prepared by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, in cooperation with affected agencies. 1966. 83 pages. 35 cents.

Federal Assistance for Recreation and Parks. Describes more than 60 Federal programs of aid to local and state agencies and non-profit private organizations for projects related to parks, recreation, cultural programs, conservation, natural beauty, historic preservation, and fish and wildlife. Lists regional offices of Federal agencies. Loose-leaf format in binder. 1966. 178 pages. $20 to members of the National Recreation and Park Association; $35 to non-members. Sold by National Recreation and Park Association, 1700 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

Federal Outdoor Recreation Programs. Describes more than 260 outdoor recreation and natural beauty-related programs of 94 Federal agencies. In addition to programs of financial assistance, credit, and technical assistance, programs related to direct Federal resource management, regulation, coordination, information and education, training, and research are identified. Compiled by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in cooperation with the affected agencies. Scheduled for publication in 1967. Approximately 240 pages. Will be sold by the Superintendent of Documents. (Requests to be notified when this publication is available may be addressed to the Office of Recreation Information, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C. 20240.)

Department Catalogs

Grants-In-Aid and Other Financial Assistance Programs Administered by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. 1966. 527 pages. $3.50. (A revised edition, current as of March 1967, is scheduled for publication by August 1967.)

Programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. 1966. 22 pages. 20 cents.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

(Additional Federal aid catalogs published by Federal agencies, by state agencies, and by others are listed in two bibliographies published by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Catalogs and Other Information Sources on Federal and State Aid Programs: A Selected Bibliography (June 1966), and a December 1966 supplement. These are available at no charge from the Commission, 1800 G St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20402.)

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

APPENDIX C

Brief summaries of Title I (Higher Education Act of 1965) and related projects of interest to the conference on

THE COLLEGE, THE COMMUNITY AND CONSERVATION

Washington, D. C.

May 22-23, 1967

Sponsored by

The Conservation Foundation
1250 Connecticut Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20036

This material is provided to help conference participants appreciate the nature and scope of one another's activities. Much of the information herein is drawn from initial proposals and early project reports. Amendments and corrections are solicited.

BAYFIELD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, University of Wisconsin,
William H. Tishler, Project Director

The proposed Apostle Island National Lakeshore may draw a million visitors a year to Bayfield County. The City of Bayfield will be the gateway to the Apostle Islands. As such it faces rapid unplanned development unless appropriate community action can be generated.

A Title I project has been funded to carry out a community design demonstration project in the city of Bayfield and Bayfield County and to stimulate development planning. Professor William Tishler, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Wisconsin will direct the project.

Other university specialists involved in the project are Louis Berninger, horticulturist, George Ziegler, landscape architect, and Doug Yanggen, land use planner. Students in the Department of Landscape Architecture will also participate. The project is designed to help the people of Bayfield analyze their community and map out development plans for the future. The City of Bayfield will receive a majority of the attention, but all of Bayfield County will be studied.

A major goal of the project will be to demonstrate that communities can analyze their local resources, develop plans, and activate programs before the pressures of rapidly growing tourism lead to a honky-tonk community. The project will not officially begin until July of this year, but specialists are already gathering data. A detailed plan for development of the area will complete the project. Publication of these plans is expected in early fall of 1968. (Summarized from project material.)

COMMONWEALTH 99 - PROBLEMS OF REGIONAL PLANNING, University of Massachusetts, J. A. Naegele, Project Director

Under the banner "Commonwealth 99", the University of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Science has instituted Title I-supported "courses of study on environmental and conservation problems and regional planning." Organizations, community officials and private citizens may ask to have these courses presented in their own localities. Conservation of air, water and urban environments have been the first topics covered. The following are brief descriptions of some of the "Commonwealth 99" activities.

An evening program to explore the causes and effects of air and water pollution in the Mystic Valley was initiated with the aid of the Mystic Valley Citizens Association.

At Waltham a 14-week course on "Air Pollution" is being given for representatives of several civic organizations once a week for 2-hour sessions. This course will be followed by a similar course on "Water Pollution" and a course on "Population Stress and Structure."

The Oliver Wendell Holmes Association, The Civic Center and Clearing House and the Boston Center for Adult Education have cooperated in conducting a program on "Our Urban Environment."

"Commonwealth 99", a brochure designed to stimulate interest in the program--offering assistance in setting up a community education program and giving information about the courses being offered at Waltham--has been circulated to interested groups throughout the state.

A 6-week summer session will be directed toward teachers who intend to establish continuing education courses in various communities in the Fall of 1967.

A newsletter, "Commonwealth 99 Reports," deals with current information on community development planning, air and water pollution, community improvement and beautification.

An Environmental Information Center has been established in the form of a reference library located in Boston.

Activities connected with a "Cleaner Air Week" in Boston resulted in the provision of approximately 25 speakers for specific speaking engagements in various communities as well as preparation of 8 exhibits on air pollution in 8 community libraries.

A seminar for the Harvard Student Conservation Club will consider air pollution and community service opportunities for students.

A 2-hour symposium on air pollution is being prepared for The Cultural Foundation to be presented at Winterfest 1967.

(Annual cost of project $60,000.) (Summarized from project material.)

AIR POLLUTION COMMUNITY SERVICES, Rutgers University, New Jersey, Joseph J. Soporowski, Project Director

The following activities and accomplishments in the field of air pollution have been made possible through the Title I Grant to Rutgers University Cooperative Extension Service:

1. Workshop - Smoke Observation Program. A 5-day training course in the enforcement of local ordinances using the Rigelmann Scale as a standard. 2. Observation Course for Municipal Police. A 4-hour course designed to instruct municipal police in the fundamentals of air pollution. 3. Legal Aspects of Air Pollution Seminar. A 1-day air pollution training program designed for the legal profession. 4. Study Program for New Jersey State Legislators. A 2-day air pollution training program specifically designed for state

senators and assemblymen. 5. Study Program for Elected Municipal Officials. A 1-day conference to provide authoritative information about the air pollution problem and its legal and administrative control, for implementation by elected local officials. 6. Air Resources Management for Planners. One-day seminar designed to emphasize the role of the planner in preventive air pollution control. 7. Air Pollution Workshop - Incinerator Training Program. A 2-day course designed to familiarize local officials with state incinerator requirements and a model ordinance for adoption by reference. 8. Air Pollution Workshop - Teachers Training Program. Two 3-hour sessions which describe the sources, effects, control and simple experiments of air pollution for integration by elementary and high school teachers into their regular classroom study. 9. Seminar on Air Pollution Control. A 12-hour educational program to familiarize the local inspector in the fundamentals of control. 10. Air Pollution Grant Workshop. One-day program to inform and instruct municipal officials in the feasibility, availability and preparation of state and federal air pollution grants. 11. Consulting service. Discussions are held on a frequent basis with various level governmental officials regarding all aspects of their individual air resource programs.

12. General Information. a. An exhibit has been constructed and is in great demand by the public. b. Education lectures are provided to action groups. c. Several pieces of literature have been prepared and distributed to all libraries in the State of New Jersey. A mailing list is also being established for further development of the libraries as central local reference sources. d. In cooperation with Rutgers and independent radio and T.V. stations, education air pollution programs are presented as a public service.

(Annual cost of project $82,500.) (Prepared by project director.)

COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, University of South Carolina, Warren K. Giese, Project Director

The project began with a comprehensive listing of volunteer and private organizations, individuals and public recreation departments which had demonstrated an interest in recreation as it may contribute to the lives of the citizens of South Carolina.

A sixteen-person advisory board appointed to discuss possible action programs defined areas of specific need as follows:

I. Upgrade recreation personnel through seminars, workshops and in-service training activities. Two seminars have been held for recreational personnel and park administrators.

II. Promote various physical activities through workshops and by training of personnel competent to teach and promote organized recreational activities. A series of workshops, demonstrations and seminars in the field of physical activity and safety in sports have been held.

III. Promote a better understanding of recreational programs and activities for mentally retarded and orthopedically handicapped people of all ages through workshops and specifically designed projects.

IV. Begin a series of pilot programs throughout the state to promote cultural recreational opportunities in art appreciation, music, music appreciation, choral groups, drama and other activities considered cultural in nature. Several such projects have been initiated.

V. Establish a five-year plan for the development of recreation in the State of South Carolina.

(Annual cost of project $40,000.) (Summarized from project material.)

LEADERSHIP TRAINING FOR TOWN CONSERVATION COMMISSIONS, University of New Hampshire, Floyd V. Barker, Project Director

In 1963 the New Hampshire General Court passed enabling legislation for the establishment of town conservation commissions, and in 1966 the State RAD Committee encouraged establishment of county-wide beautification committees.

In many cases, public-spirited citizens are now at work in such organizations on difficult problems of planning and action to preserve, acquire, manage and enhance local natural resources.

The New Hampshire Cooperative Extension Service is undertaking to improve the preparation of these key community leaders for community action programs. This project is extending to such leaders the specialized talents of the university and appropriate state and federal agencies, developing demonstration programs and stimulating public awareness of natural resource conservation needs.

This is a three-year project with a full-time staff position. It will include preparation of information leaflets and fact sheets, community workshops and seminars, university short courses and extension courses, as well as development of a program for educational television.

(Annual cost of project $16,900.) (Excerpted by CF from Office of Education project report.)

CENTER FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, Humboldt State College, California, William Murison, Project Director

At California's Humboldt State College, the Center for Community Development, funded primarily through Title I, was initiated last August. Staffed by a director and associate director, the Center is designed to bring the college into the community and the community into the college.

At the Center's March 10-11 seminar in local government, officials from five northwest California counties heard faculty presentations and joined in discussions concerning their region's forest products industry, a redwood park's economic impact, regional welfare loads, local government revenues, county economic projections, intergovernmental relationships and land-use planning.

The Center has, in Dr. Murison's words: "helped others to lay out parks, plan festivals, conduct music activity days for elementary school children, run workshops for contractors and elementary school principals, conduct conferences on wood exports, a symposium on Humboldt Bay, poetry readings for kids, open teen centers, initiate remedial educational programs, organize book fairs, make better use of schools, maintain control over fluctuating lake levels, decide on the validity of proposed oyster operations, enjoy folk music, plan for a trip to the city for rural children, take classical pianists to remote rural areas, build boat ramps, develop an appreciation for natural beauty, frame a local ordinance concerning billboards, interest business climate and bring college and community closer together. It has been a busy six months."

(Annual cost of project $78,000.) (Summarized from project material.)

THE MAINE COAST: DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION, Bowdoin College
John McKee and Dana A. Little, Project Directors

Bowdoin College's project developed out of a photographic exhibition entitled "As Maine Goes" depicting the despoilment of Maine's coast through neglect, speculation and commercialization. Commissioned by Bowdoin's Museum of Art, the exhibition opened in the spring of 1966, and the response encouraged Bowdoin to seek funds under Title I to continue drawing public attention to this problem area.

Aside from arranging showings of the "As Maine Goes" exhibition and distributing its illustrated catalog, Bowdoin sponsored a three-day symposium in October 1966, drawing together authorities in economics, biology, land-use planning and related fields. Influential Maine citizens were invited to attend and take part in the discussion. Copies of the proceedings have been sent to all members of the state legislature, public and school libraries throughout the state, newspaper editors and any other persons or groups requesting them. A second publication, presenting in illustrated format the gist of the symposium, is now being distributed.

The impact of the project has been felt both in local action and in legislation being considered in Augusta. Meanwhile, Bowdoin is seeking funds to undertake a comprehensive land-use planning program in conjunction with the state planning office.

(Annual cost of project $61,000.) (Prepared by project directors.)

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN TOWNS AND SMALL CITIES, Oregon State University, Ted Sidor, Project Director

Two Community Development Agents have provided educational assistance to towns and small cities under 5,500 in population in three counties in the Willamette Valley. A similar program has been funded for one agent in five counties in Northeast Oregon and will start in July, 1967.

Assistance rendered includes information and action on (1) grant and loan programs (what is available?, how to apply?, who to contact?, and how to develop community interest?); (2) development of a "T.A.S.C." newsletter to inform community leaders of programs and successes of other communities; (3) developing community improvement study committees; (4) developing acquaintances and understanding of people and programs of other agencies; (5) determining problem areas where educational programs would be beneficial to several communities.

Problems have been identified and educational short courses have been held dealing with planning and zoning, budgeting, recreation, leader training, beautification, water and sewer programs and bond issue campaigns.

Direct assistance, based on requests, and in order of greatest number are as follows: federal aid, parks and recreation, sewage development, municipal planning, leadership assistance, water, youth, employment, legal organization, housing, business development, community survey, library and urban renewal. (Prepared by project director.)

POTOMAC RIVER BASIN DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, Frostburg State College, Maryland, J. Russell Snyder, Project Director

This "Educational Research Program" is expected to demonstrate to other jurisdictions in the Potomac Basin methods of achieving local, state and national objectives for the improvement and development of the Potomac River Basin. The George's Creek Watershed in Allegany and Garrett Counties, Maryland, is to be the area for this research and demonstration program. New theories of problem solving, using interdisciplinary approaches, will be tested.

Objectives are as follows:

1. to demonstrate how Potomac Basin residents can be effectively involved in achieving multi-faceted and interrelated basin-management objectives;
2. to demonstrate that effective national or state plans for the Potomac must be based on precise and thorough knowledge of critical local resources, i.e., George's Creek;
3. to provide responsible authorities and local citizenry with alternative courses of action, with costs and benefits determined, responsibilities identified, and feasible cost sharing suggested;

4. to identify the sources of technical and financial assistance;

5. to produce a "case study," which will be useful to other jurisdictions in the Basin.

(Annual cost of project $64,000.) (Summarized from project material.)

NEW JERSEY CITIZENS AND POLLUTION CONTROL, Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey, Samuel Pratt, Project Director

"The New Jersey Citizen's Role in Pollution Control" is a traveling community program presented by Fairleigh Dickinson University to alert the residents of communities visited to the problems of air and water pollution. The presentation consists of opening remarks by a discussion leader, the screening of videotapes on air and water pollution and a discussion session. The causes, effects and control of pollution are covered. The videotapes are from a conference on "The Demands of Pollution Control Legislation" held at Fairleigh Dickinson in August 1966, in which national authorities in science, education, government and industry participated.

This traveling project is part of a program to inform New Jersey residents on various types of pollution (including visual, noise and odor pollution). Current projects include a survey on sensitivity to and concern about pollution, and two one-day orientation programs on air and water pollution for leaders from fifty municipalities throughout the state, to be offered in June 1967.

A Title I project has also been initiated at Fairleigh Dickinson to train community recreation leaders, which it is hoped will lead to a recreation master plan combining physical facilities and recreation programs in each community.

Fairleigh Dickinson is also conducting a Title I project designed to increase citizen participation in local government. A Volunteers in Government Corps is being created using Morris County as the demonstration area.

(Annual cost of project $44,000.) (Summarized from project material.)

TITLE I PROJECTS IN KENTUCKY RELATING TO CONSERVATION, Eastern Kentucky University, James McDonald, Title I Coordinator, Kentucky

In the last year the Kentucky Title I program has funded one project with a direct relationship to conservation. The project conducted at Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky, by Dr. Fred Darling and Dr. James McChesney established a recreation consultant service for Eastern Kentucky. One of the project objectives was to assist local county and community leaders in the establishment of public recreation programs. In addition, a series of three workshops were held at the Eastern Kentucky University Campus for recreation leaders throughout Eastern Kentucky.

In the coming year our plans include the continuance of the Eastern Kentucky University project together with similar projects to be conducted at Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky, the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, and the University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky. In addition, we are in the process of forming an informal organization of university faculty members interested in recreation. This organization will have as its membership the key recreation educator from each of the state universities in Kentucky. In addition, it will have a rather broadly representative advisory council. It will divide the state into regions for the purpose of coordinating all efforts at recreation education with private interests and the state government. (Prepared by State Title I coordinator.)

STATE AND COUNTY PLANNING SEMINAR, Wilkes College, Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania, Eugene S. Farley and Hugo Mailey

As described in its initial proposal, Wilkes College planned four seminars for county commissioners of four counties. The purpose was to interpret the goals of the State Planning Board for their region and the relationship of these goals to present county planning activities. Problems which extend beyond county lines were to receive particular attention.

One goal of the seminars was conceived as seeking regular joint planning meetings covering the four counties. The seminars were to be directed by the Institute of Regional Affairs of Wilkes College.

(Annual cost of project $1,700.) (Excerpted by CF from Office of Education project report.)

AIR, WATER, AND SOLID WASTE POLLUTION CLINIC, Ohio State University, George P. Hanna

As described in the initial proposal, a two-day clinic was designed to familiarize municipal and other local administrators with current aspects of air, water and solid waste pollution abatement procedures. Emphasis was to be placed on technical tools available, coordination of overall problems, and available means of financing abatement and control programs. The program would be directed toward intermediate urban communities of 10,000 to 100,000 population which lack planning and counseling facilities available to larger urban areas.

The clinic was to involve a total of 12 hours of material presentation and discussion. The facilities and personnel of The Water Resources Center at Ohio State would be utilized, and participants would include city managers, councilmen, county commissioners, mayors and service directors.

(Annual cost of project $3,900.) (Excerpted by CF from Office of Education project report.)

HIGHWAY SYSTEMS AND NATURAL BEAUTY, University of Washington, Seattle, Thomas R. Waggener, Project Director

The College of Forestry at the University of Washington initiated a Title I project to bring information on highway soil conditions and the use of vegetation in urban development to responsible officials, technical personnel and community leaders. A series of seminars, discussions and short courses was planned to explain soils and plant materials as they apply to highway, urban and suburban construction. Faculty and facilities of the College of Forestry, including the University of Washington's Arboretum, were to be used in the project.

(Annual cost of project $14,900.) (Excerpted by CF from Office of Education project report.)

LAND USE PLANNING IN THE URBAN FRINGE, University of Missouri at Columbia, Stirling Kyd, Project Director

As described in its initial proposal, the University of Missouri has developed a Title I project to assist elected and appointed officials and professional and technical personnel of urban fringe communities. Plans include courses and seminars combining geologic, engineering and economic aspects of urban fringe land-use problems with respect to terrain analyses, growth potential, planning for public services and alternative taxing procedures.

Three courses are to be offered: (1) General Urban Fringe Philosophy, (2) Engineering Factors for Urban Fringe Planning, (3) Economic Aspects of Urban Fringe Planning. Each was designed to cover 9 one-hour sessions (for elected officials) or 18 one-hour sessions (for professional and technical personnel).

(Annual cost of project $28,500.) (Excerpted by CF from Office of Education project report.)

CALIFORNIA OPEN SPACE PROGRAM, University of California at Davis, Lloyd Woodruff, Project Director

The University of California Extension, Davis Campus, has conducted a Title I project in the form of a one-day conference in cooperation with the State Office of Planning and the University of California (Davis) Chancellor's Committee on Regional Planning. The objective of the conference was to bring together open space experts, governmental officials, civic leaders and citizens of the Davis Extension Area to discuss various aspects of the new (November, 1966) California Open Space Amendment. Over 300 people attended the conference and heard speakers and discussions on the following subjects: the importance of open space programs; planning open space programs; the Open Space Amendment; key issues and ideas in the implementation of the amendment; and the politics of the situation. (Summarized from project material.)

LAND USE PATTERNS AND COMMUNITY TAXES, Kent State University, Ohio, James G. Coke, Project Director

A project conceived by the Center for Urban Regionalism at Kent State University involves a study of community land use patterns and the relation of these to the tax base and demands for urban services. Information gained by the study is to help define sound planning techniques. A series of conferences would be held to disseminate this information to selected individuals in the communities concerned.

The primary objective of the project is to inform and assist officials who are responsible for making land-use decisions.

(Annual cost of project $39,600.) (Excerpted by CF from Office of Education project report.)

OTHER TITLE I PROJECTS NOT EXPECTED TO BE REPRESENTED BY CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Western Washington State College is conducting 23 lecture/discussion sessions focusing on "The Water Dilemma" and "The Challenge of Regional Development." National and regional authorities on water and planning have joined WWSC faculty members in conducting the series, which is open to the general public. Contact: F.R. Feringer, Director, Continuing Studies, Western Washington State College, Bellingham, Washington. (Annual cost of project $6,700.)

Iowa State University is conducting conferences and training programs for government officials and community leaders on problems of water pollution control and sanitation. Objectives are: (1) to improve facilities for collection and treatment of municipal and industrial wastes, (2) to improve disposal systems for garbage and rubbish, and (3) enactment of a state plumbing code. Contact: Marvin A. Anderson, Dean, University Extension, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa. (Annual cost of project $8,600.)

The University of Michigan plans to initiate a project which will provide information on environmental resources to Michigan communities. The results of the initial investigatory phase will serve as a model for an independent study course on "Environmental Resource Problems of the Urban Community" to be offered by the University Extension Service. Contact: William Stapp, Associate Professor of Conservation, School of Natural Resources, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. (Annual cost of project $59,900.)

Iowa State University's Department of Landscape Architecture has initiated a project designed for volunteer and paid community planners and other interested persons. Nine instruction sessions are being held at each of four sites on the basis of one session at each site each week. Contact: Thomas A. Barton, Head, Landscape Architecture Department, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50010. (Annual cost of project $23,000.)

A Southern Methodist University project proposal provides for a seminar on urban and regional planning for engineers, city and county planning officials, zoning and planning commission members and city administrative officials and councilmen in ten Dallas-Fort Worth region counties. The one-week program is based on a need for exchange of ideas among officials and laymen responsible for planning and control of urban growth. Contact: LeVan Griffis, Director, Office of Research Services, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75222. (Annual cost of project $4,500.)

The University of Iowa has planned a park and recreation conference designed to give aid and direction to Iowa county conservation boards and municipal park and recreation departments in the development of parks and outdoor recreation areas. The conference was designed to introduce new ideas, concepts and programs for recreational development. Contact: E.A. Scholer, Director Recreation Program, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. (Annual cost of project $2,150.)

A Newark (N.J.) College of Engineering project consists of five one-day programs on water resources and pollution control for public officials, engineers, managers of public utilities and treatment systems, industrial representatives and interested citizen groups. A team of government and private experts is covering the law, technology, planning, financing and administration of waste water treatment and re-use. Contact: Clarence Stephens, Director, Division of Continuing Studies, 323 High Street, Newark, New Jersey 07102. (Annual cost of project $16,000.)

The University of Maryland plans a beautification demonstration project for small communities. The project will be carried out in the town of Mt. Savage, and a beautification handbook will be prepared for use in other small communities. Contact: George E. Allen, Area Extension Agent, Court House, Cumberland, Maryland 21502.

TITLE I of
Public Law 89-329
89th Congress, H. R. 9567
November 8, 1965

An Act

79 STAT. 1219

To strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Higher Education Act of 1965".

TITLE I—COMMUNITY SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 101. For the purpose of assisting the people of the United States in the solution of community problems such as housing, poverty, government, recreation, employment, youth opportunities, transportation, health, and land use by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this title to strengthen community service programs of colleges and universities, there are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the succeeding fiscal year. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, there may be appropriated, to enable the Commissioner to make such grants, only such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM

SEC. 102. For purposes of this title, the term "community service program" means an educational program, activity, or service, including a research program and a university extension or continuing education offering, which is designed to assist in the solution of community problems in rural, urban, or suburban areas, with particular emphasis on urban and suburban problems, where the institution offering such program, activity, or service determines—

(1) that the proposed program, activity, or service is not otherwise available, and

(2) that the conduct of the program or performance of the activity or service is consistent with the institution's over-all educational program and is of such a nature as is appropriate to the effective utilization of the institution's special resources and the competencies of its faculty.

Where course offerings are involved, such courses must be university extension or continuing education courses and must be—

(A) fully acceptable toward an academic degree, or

(B) of college level as determined by the institution offering such courses.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 103. (a) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot $25,000 each to Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and $100,000 to each of the other States, and he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the remainder of such sums as the population of the State bears to the population of all States.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(c) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of its allotment under this title be added to the allotment of another State under this title for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share of the cost of providing community service programs under this title. If it is found by the Commissioner that the programs with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of such State's allotment, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, such portion of such State's allotment shall be added to the allotment of the other State under this title to be used for the purpose referred to above.

(d) The population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce.

USES OF ALLOTTED FUNDS

SEC. 104. A State's allotment under section 103 may be used, in accordance with its State plan approved under section 105(b), to provide new, expanded, or improved community service programs.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 105. (a) Any State desiring to receive its allotment of Federal funds under this title shall designate or create a State agency or institution which has special qualifications with respect to solving community problems and which is broadly representative of institutions of higher education in the State which are competent to offer community service programs, and shall submit to the Commissioner through the agency or institution so designated a State plan. If a State desires to designate for the purposes of this section an existing State agency or institution which does not meet these requirements, it may do so if the agency or institution takes such action as may be necessary to acquire such qualifications and assure participation of such institutions, or if it designates or creates a State advisory council which meets the requirements not met by the designated agency or institution to consult with the designated agency or institution in the preparation of the State plan. A State plan submitted under this title shall be in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary and shall—

(1) provide that the agency or institution so designated or created shall be the sole agency for administration of the plan or for supervision of the administration of the plan; and provide that such agency or institution shall consult with any State advisory council required to be created by this section with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of such plan;

(2) set forth a comprehensive, coordinated, and statewide system of community service programs under which funds paid to the State (including funds paid to an institution pursuant to section 106(c)) under its allotments under section 103 will be expended solely for community service programs which have been approved by the agency or institution administering the plan;

(3) set forth the policies and procedures to be followed in allocating Federal funds to institutions of higher education in the State, which policies and procedures shall insure that due consideration will be given—

(A) to the relative capacity and willingness of particular institutions of higher education (whether public or private) to provide effective community service programs;

(B) to the availability of and need for community service programs among the population within the State; and

(C) to the results of periodic evaluations of the programs carried out under this title in the light of information regarding current and anticipated community problems in the State;

(4) set forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as not to supplant State or local funds, or funds of institutions of higher education, but to supplement and, to the extent practicable, to increase the amounts of such funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for community service programs;

(5) set forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State or by the Commissioner to institutions of higher education) under this title; and

(6) provide for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

PAYMENTS

SEC. 106. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), payment under this title shall be made to those State agencies and institutions which administer plans approved under section 105(b). Payments under this title from a State's allotment with respect to the cost of developing and carrying out its State plan shall equal 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 75 per centum of such costs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and 50 per centum of such costs for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, except that no payments for any fiscal year shall be made to any State with respect to expenditures for developing and administering the State plan which exceed 5 per centum of the costs for that year for which payment under this subsection may be made to that State, or $25,000, whichever is the greater. In determining the cost of developing and carrying out a State's plan, there shall be excluded any cost with respect to which payments were received under any other Federal program.

(b) No payments shall be made to any State from its allotments for any fiscal year unless and until the Commissioner finds that the institutions of higher education which will participate in carrying out the State plan for that year will together have available during that year for expenditure from non-Federal sources for college and university extension and continuing education programs not less than the total amount actually expended by those institutions for college and university extension and continuing education programs from such sources during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, plus an amount equal to not less than the non-Federal share of the costs with respect to which payment pursuant to subsection (a) is sought.

(c) Payments to a State under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, and they may be paid directly to the State or to one or more participating institutions of higher education designated for this purpose by the State, or to both.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 107. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency or institution submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency or institution administering a State plan approved under section 105(b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 105(a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify the State agency or institution that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 105(a) or with his final action under section 107(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EXTENSION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

SEC. 109. (a) The President shall, within ninety days of enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education (hereafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Labor, Interior, State, and Housing and Urban Development, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and of such other Federal agencies having extension education responsibilities as the President may designate, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the fields of extension and continuing education, State and local officials, and other persons having special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to community problems, and persons representative of the general public. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 105(b), and policies to eliminate duplication and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering extension or continuing education activities and services.

(c) The Advisory Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of all federally supported extension and continuing education programs, including community service programs, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports commencing on March 31, 1967, of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and other Federal laws relating to extension and continuing education activities) to the Secretary and to the President. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(d) Members of the Advisory Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(e) The Secretary shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Advisory Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out its functions.

(f) In carrying out its functions pursuant to this section, the Advisory Council may utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary and the head of such agency.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 110. Nothing in this title shall modify authorities under the Act of February 23, 1917 (Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act), as amended (20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28); the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, and 15aaa–15ggg); the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (20 U.S.C. 35–35n); title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–560); or the Act of May 8, 1914 (Smith-Lever Act), as amended (7 U.S.C. 341–348).

LIMITATION

SEC. 111. No grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

SOME OTHER CONSERVATION FOUNDATION PUBLICATIONS*

CF Letter -- Periodic report on environmental issues. Published by CF about 12 times a year. Free.

Concepts of Conservation -- Guide to discussion of some fundamental problems of resource use. Published by CF for teachers, organization discussion leaders. Single copy free; bulk rates on request.

Bulletin on Conservation Education -- Published by CF for teachers, three times a year. Describes conservation education programs, new visual aids. Free.

America The Beautiful, *Challenge To Youth*, and *The Role of Foundations and Universities in Conservation* -- Texts of addresses by CF President Russell E. Train. Free.

Three Approaches To Environmental Resource Analysis, by Landscape Architecture Research Office, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University, 1967. Sponsored, published by, and available from CF. $2.00.

A Critical Index of Films and Filmstrips in Conservation -- Lists films, filmstrips recommended by CF on various aspects of conservation, 1967. Available only from O'Hare Books, Ten Bartley Road, Flanders, N.J. 07836. $1.00.

A Citizen's Potomac Planning Guide -- Description of federal and state planning for the Potomac River Basin, with suggestions for citizen participation. 1965. Free.

Comments on a Brief Reconnaissance of Resource Use, Progress and Conservation Needs in Some Latin American Countries, by CF Secretary William Vogt. Free.

La Conservacion Human En El Centro America -- Summary of 1966 conference held in Guatemala. (In Spanish.) Free.

The Conservationists' View of Conservation - *Needs for Research and Education*, by CF President Russell E. Train. Reprint from The Science Teacher, April, 1967. Free.

U.S. Rivers: Can Their Natural Values Be Restored and Their Economic Values Retained? -- by CF Senior Associate Sydney Howe. Vital Issues, Vol. XVI, No. 2, 1966. Available only from Center for Information on America, Washington, Conn. 06793. 35¢.

The Unity of Ecology, by CF Vice President F. Fraser Darling. Reprint from November, 1963, Advancement of Science. Free.

Conservation and Ecological Theory, by CF Vice President F. Fraser Darling. Reprint from Journal of Ecology 52 (Suppl.), 39-45. Free.

Future Environments of North America, edited by F. Fraser Darling and John P. Milton. Natural History Press, 1966. $12.50.

Alaska -- *A Challenge in Conservation*, by Richard A. Cooley. University of Wisconsin Press, 1966. $5.50.

Pockets of Hope, by Martha Munzer. Alfred A. Knopf, 1967. $4.50.

Planning Our Town, by Martha Munzer. Alfred A. Knopf, 1964. $3.95.

Pesticides and The Living Landscape, by Robert L. Rudd. University of Wisconsin Press, 1964. $6.50.

Politics and Conservation -- *The Decline of the Alaska Salmon*, by Richard A. Cooley. Harper and Row, 1963. $5.00.

Our Crowded Planet: Essays on The Pressures of Population, edited by Fairfield Osborn. Doubleday & Co., 1962. $3.95.

Natural Resources -- *Quality and Quantity*, edited by S. V. Ciriacy-Wantrup and James J. Parsons. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1967. $6.50.

Environmental Studies series -- Four volumes edited by Lynton K. Caldwell. Published by and available only from Institute of Public Administration, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. 1967.

Pesticides and Stream Insects, by John Dimond. Published by Maine Forest Service and CF. 1967. Free.

Aquatic Insects and DDT Forest Spraying in Maine, by John Richard Gorham. Published by Maine Forest Service and CF, 1961. Free.

* -- Includes CF's own publications and publications resulting from CF-sponsored studies, seminars, conferences, etc. For free items, write The Conservation Foundation, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.